FBIS DAILY REPORT CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 133 11 July 1983

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

Reagan Discusses Missile Plans With Commission AA 1
U.S. Missile Deployment Plans in Europe Hit AA 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Jul]
U.S. Arms Stance 'Unacceptable' at Geneva Talks AA 4
Disarmament Conference Ends; Promotes Detente AA 5

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

SED, PZPR CC Politburos Approve Moscow Meeting BB 1
[PRAVDA 7 Jul]
'New Economic Blockade' Against CEMA States Hit BB 3

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 1
[Andriyanov, Volskiy, Nekrasov]
Soviet-West German Talks CC 1
U.S.-Asian Alliance CC 3
Shultz, Bush Trips CC 5
Madrid CSCE Meeting CC 7
'International Situation: Questions & Answers' CC 8
[Gubernatorov, Kovalev, Belyayev, Andrianov]
Madrid, Geneva Meetings CC 8
Lebanese Peace Agreement CC 11
ILO Discussed CC 14
Japanese Militarization CC 14
'Ideological Saboteurs' Float Ali Agca Charge CC 16
[Muravyov]

NORTHEAST ASIA

Materials on DPRK Friendship Treaty Anniversary C 1
PRAVDA Cites NODONG SINMUN [7 Jul] C 1
Moscow Soiree 5 Jul [PRAVDA 7 Jul] C 1
Moscow Meeting 6 Jul C 1
Amity Society Sends Greetings C 2
IZVESTIYA Accuses Japanese Fishermen of Spying [8 Jul] C 2

SOUTH ASIA

DRA's Karmal Leaves Irkutsk for Ulaanbaatar D 1
[Kabul]
USSR-DRA Economic Commission Activities Outlined D 1
[PRAVDA 7 Jul]
Shultz Remarks During Pakistan Visit Scored D 1
Backing for Rebels, Haq D 1
[Kolganov in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 6 Jul]
Pakistani-Afghan Talks [Korolev] D 2
Pakistan Continues Provocations Against India D 3
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Jul]
Further on Visit of India's Rajiv Gandhi D 4
Talks With Gromyko D 4
Talks With Ponomarev D 4
Trade Talks With Patolichev D 5
Indian Minister Meeting With Media Officials D 5
[Delhi]
India Getting Aid on Metallurgical Equipment D 5
[Delhi]

EASTERN EUROPE

CSSR Defense Minister Dzur on Friendly Visit F 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Jul]
Comparison on Tikhonov Meeting F 1
Kadar-Led Delegation To Visit Moscow Mid-July F 1
USSR Congratulates New Hungarian Foreign Minister F 2
Soviet Ambassadorial Appointments Announced F 2
Envoy to Poland F 2
Ambassador to Bulgaria F 2

WESTERN EUROPE

Media Coverage of Kohl's Official Visit G 1
SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA on Visit [8 Jul] G 1
'Maintaining Permanent Dialogue' G 3
Aims 'Mutually Exclusive' [Mnatsakanov] G 4
Bush's European Tour 'Doomed Before Started' G 5
[Kozyakov]
Lambsdorff on Future for FRG-USSR Economic Ties G 6
[IZVESTIYA 1 Jul]
FRG's Genscher Arrives in U.S. for Talks G 7
SPD Article Critical of Foreign Policy Cited G 7
[PRAVDA 7 Jul]
Danish CP Delegation Pays Visit to USSR G 8
[PRAVDA 6 Jul]

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Commentaries on Shultz' Mission to Middle East H 1
Trip Ends in 'Failure' H 1
Shabayev on 'Failure' H 1
U.S., Israeli Goals H 2
Reagan's Anti-Arab Stand H 3
PLO Officials on Need for Palestinian Unity H 5
Abu Mahir Interview H 5
DFLP Delegates' Press Conference H 6
Qaddumi Due in Moscow To Prepare 'Arafat Visit [SPA] H 7

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

U.S., French Roles in Chad Conflict Criticized J 1
Air Bridge in Ndjamena J 1
Military Operations Intensifying J 1

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

CPSU Politburo on Kohl Talks, Shevardnadze Report R 1
Dolgikh, Ryzhkov, Others Attend CPSU CC Meeting R 2
USSR Anti-Zionist Committee Denounces Israel R 2
[PRAVDA 6 Jul]
Leningrad Crime Prevention Conference Ends R 3
[IZVESTIYA 1 Jul]

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Stockholm: 3 USSR Underground Nuclear Explosions U 1
TASS Reports Launch of Cosmos-1481 Satellite U 1
Marchuk Takes Part in Moscow Computer Conference U 1
[TRUD 22 Jun]

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Military Leaders Address Graduation Ceremonies V 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Jun]

REAGAN DISCUSSES MISSILE PLANS WITH COMMISSION

LD092201 Moscow TASS in English 2137 GMT 9 Jul 83

[Text] Washington July 9 TASS -- Larry Speakes, deputy press secretary of the White House, has said that Reagan discussed plans for the construction and deployment of 100 MX intercontinental ballistic missiles as well as for the creation of 1,000 lighter-weight single-warhead "Midgetman" strategic missiles with the members of the Strategic Forces Commission.

Both programmes, according to the most preliminary estimates of the Department of the Air Force, will cost the U.S. taxpayers 90,000 million dollars. The Air Force asked 604 million dollars in the current year for research under the "Midgetman" programme alone. By the 1988 financial year, annual appropriations for the programme will be brought up to 1,000 million dollars. A round sum of money has already been allocated also for the production of MX missiles each of which will be provided with ten nuclear warheads.

The White House and the Pentagon started implementing dangerous plans despite vigorous protests by the public at large that does not wish to become a hostage of the adventurist policy of nuclear blackmail. By way of massive pressure on the legislators the White House has still managed to put respective appropriations through Congress. Activated was a powerful apparatus of official propaganda which raised to another stage a campaign of intensive intimidation of the Americans by a mythical "Soviet threat" and which at the same time picked up the administration's false thesis that the creation of new missile systems will ostensibly lead to a "stabilisation" of the strategic arms race. However, as has been admitted by the U.S. press itself, both "Midgetman" and MX missiles are an offensive weapon. So, it is a question not of "stabilisation" but of a further build-up of nuclear missile arsenals. Thus, the ASSOCIATED PRESS with reference to authoritative experts directly points out that MX missiles are in actual fact a potential first-strike weapon and that their deployment will only enhance chances of unleashing a nuclear war.

U.S. MISSILE DEPLOYMENT PLANS IN EUROPE HIT

PM092133 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Jul 83 First Edition p 3

[Colonel M. Ponomarev "Military-Political Review": "Pressure on Partners"]

[Text] At the May meeting of the leaders of the seven leading capitalist states which took place in the small American town of Williamsburg, a broad program was drawn up for the further whipping up of anti-Soviet hysteria, brazen militarism, and for recklessly toying with the destiny of peace and of the security of the peoples. The United States was the initiator of the adoption of this program which is formulated in the notorious "Political Declaration on Security Questions." The United States managed to foist upon the other participants of the conference its own aggressive course and it got them to confirm their adherence to the policy of building up nuclear arsenals and deploying the latest arms systems.

The line was developed further at the June session of the NATO council in Paris. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA has already characterized the main decisions adopted by the session's participants. It only remains to recall that in Paris, too, the United States succeeded in imposing its will on its partners, above all enlisting their consent to further speeding up nuclear armament, and sabotaging the Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva. The session of the North Atlantic bloc's council confirmed the plans for the stationing on the territory of a number of West European states of new medium-range American missile facilities -- Pershing II missiles and cruise missiles.

The implementation of these plans betokens a new round of the nuclear arms race in Europe and threatens consequences that are unpredictable. After all, it is a question of an attempt by the NATO bloc to radically alter the strategic situation in Europe to the detriment of the vital interests of the USSR and its allies. The danger is all the more obvious because the preparations for the deployment of the U.S. first-strike weapons are being conducted in conditions where Washington is propagandizing the idea of the possibility, and virtually the rightfulness of a "limited" nuclear war -- limited, to judge by all accounts, to Europe. During his conversation with FRG Chancellor H. Kohl, Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, stressed in this connection: "It is intended to transform FRG territory into a lauchpad for U.S. first-strike nuclear missiles targeted against the Soviet Union and its allies. In essence this would mean a revival of the threat of a war against the USSR being unleashed from German soil."

In these conditions an acute and perfectly understandable appreciation of the danger lurking in the international situation that has taken shape and in the militarist preparations of the United States and NATO has become widespread in Western Europe. The peoples of the West European countries are stepping up their resistance to these plans. They see the future of the continent not in a further arms race -- nuclear and conventional -- and not in the whipping up of tension, but along the paths of preserving and deepening detente and the development of peaceful coexistence among states. The peoples' desire for peace and security has engendered a mighty antiwar movement in which representatives of various public circles and people of diverse political convictions participate.

They regard the consistent and principled peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist states and their struggle to consolidate the security of the peoples as increasingly attractive. The USSR is persistently seeking to lower the level of nuclear confrontation in Europe. As far as medium-range nuclear missile facilities are concerned, the Soviet Union advocates an honest, just agreement that does not infringe upon anyone's interests. It is precisely from these positions that the USSR operates at the talks on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe which are being conducted in Geneva.

But in order that mutually acceptable accords may be reached during the negotiations the wish for this is necessary on both sides. But as facts show, this desire is lacking on the American side. The proposals that the American side makes lead matters in the direction of building up the U.S. nuclear potential in Europe by a certain number of medium-range missiles and forcing the Soviet Union to destroy all its missiles of the same type over and above the number that will be deployed by the United States. The pretense is made here that the 160 British and French missiles do not exist at all on the NATO side, and that the 700 or so U.S. aircraft carry nuclear weapons in the European zone and which also fall into the category of medium-range arms, are nonexistent. In other words, the entire U.S. stance at the Geneva talks is built upon deception -- deliberate deception in order to drive the talks into an impasse and to achieve the implementation of its longstanding objective -- to deploy Pershing and cruise missiles on European soil. In other words, the United States would like to place itself in a monopoly position by deploying nuclear missiles hard by the USSR capable of hitting targets deep within Soviet territory, whereas the USSR does not and, according to U.S. logic, must not, of course, have a comparable potential somewhere near the United States. The Soviet Union naturally cannot agree to this. After all, a monopoly position or, in other words, U.S. military superiority over the USSR, would lead to a sharp increase in the threat to our country and would undermine the security of the very West European countries to which Washington has been able to dictate its will without turning a hair and to involve in any military adventure.

And in order to whitewash Washington's dangerous adventurist course in the eyes of the public, the U.S. Administration embarked on its latest maneuver the other day. U.S. Vice President G. Bush was sent on a tour of West European countries. He was charged with several simultaneous tasks. First, to expedite the practical implementation of the program adopted in Williamsburg and concretized at the NATO Council Session in Paris. And at the same time to try to persuade the West Europeans of the Reagan administration's "love of peace" and of the "sincerity" of its professed eagerness for arms control. Furthermore, Bush was to enlist support for U.S. actions in Central America and to resolve certain other problems. In a nutshell, he was to ensure the unconditional alignment of the West European NATO countries with Washington.

Did the vice president succeed in resolving the tasks with which he had been charged? Observers are unanimous: Bush's mission was essentially a failure. Only in London did he succeed fully in getting what he wanted. Great Britain's Conservative government expressed its consent to the deployment of U.S. cruise missiles ahead of schedule, that is, even before the outcome of the Soviet-American Geneva talks on the limitation of nuclear armaments in Europe.

In other countries, even in the FRG, Bush was forced to content himself with far less. And although West German Chancellor Kohl assured the visitor from across the ocean that "if a miracle does not occur at the negotiations -- and all the indicators are that it will not -- the deployment of the missiles will go ahead." Bush left the FRG in extremely low spirits. The reason for this was his direct confrontation with members of the antiwar movement in the West German city of Krefeld -- that same city where the manifesto known as the "Krefeld Appeal" was adopted calling for the renunciation of the deployment of U.S. missiles. More than 4 million West German citizens have signed it.

Some 20,000 fighters against the threat of nuclear war came out on the streets of Krefeld. Rocks, bottles, and rotten vegetables flew at Bush's armor-plated limousine. Later, when trying to put a brave face on matters, Bush called these demonstrators "a handful of desperate people, paid hirelings." But he could hardly have believed that himself. In fact he had had to come face to face with the real spokesmen of West German public opinion.

Bush also had to encounter the energetic actions of members of the antiwar movement in other countries which he visited, particularly in Norway, Denmark, and Ireland. Nevertheless, everywhere he continued to follow his own former course, only slightly varying the themes of his talks and public speeches.

Thus, during his tour of the Scandinavian countries, the U.S. vice president opposed the idea of the creation of nuclear-free zones in northern Europe and indeed anywhere. And he attempted everywhere to glorify Washington's policy, the U.S. administration's course toward confrontation with the Soviet Union, toward preparations for nuclear war -- a course which threatens the peoples with incalculable calamities.

Is it possible to avert such a dangerous development of events? Undoubtedly it is. Leading party and state figures of the socialist states pointed this out at the meeting which took place in Moscow. As the joint statement adopted at the meeting says, its participants regard as a key issue of our time the speediest ending of the arms race and the transition to disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament. They believe that it is essential to do everything to bring about these vital objectives, for the preservation of peace, civilization, and life on earth. And the elimination of the threat of a nuclear confrontation on the European Continent is of the greatest significance on this plane.

Full support was expressed at the meeting for the Soviet proposals aimed at a just reduction of the medium-range nuclear arms existing at present. Striving for the complete liberation of Europe from nuclear weapons, both medium-range and also tactical, the socialist states deem it essential to secure at least the kind of understanding which would rule out the stationing of new U.S. nuclear missiles in West European countries and which would envisage the reduction of medium-range facilities existing in Europe for the purpose of ensuring an equilibrium at the lowest level. Of course, the fundamental principle and identical security of the sides must be observed here.

The participants in the Moscow meeting appealed once again to the member-states of the NATO bloc to agree to the practical examination of the proposal for a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and on the maintenance of relations of peace between the Warsaw Pact and NATO member-states, open to all states of the world. The joint statement confirms and concretizes many other proposals aimed at improving the situation on the European Continent and throughout the world. The socialist states expressed readiness to pool their efforts with the efforts of all countries, regardless of their sociopolitical systems, and with all who advocate the strengthening of peace and international security, for the purpose of implementing practical steps capable of averting a catastrophe.

One would have thought that this appeal had to be headed in the NATO capitals. However, as before they are deaf to the voice of reason there. At best the matter gets no further than statements that the Warsaw Pact states' proposals "are being studied." Otherwise attempts are generally made to assert that the Moscow meeting "provided nothing new."

All this ties in with the unceremonious pressure brought to bear by the United States on its partners. In yielding to this pressure, they are frequently forced to act contrary to the fundamental and vital interests of their own peoples. That is the case too as regards preparations for the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles. A realization of the danger that the deployment of these missiles represents is increasing, but the work continues nevertheless.

In an attempt to weaken the antiwar movement and to dupe and disorient its members, the politicians from the NATO countries constantly reiterate that after the new U.S. missiles are brought into Europe the USSR will make concessions at the Geneva negotiations. This is a profound and dangerous delusion. "If the point of deployment is reached," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov has pointed out, "we will not relinquish our positions, we will not weaken our defense, but we will take prompt and effective measures in response so as to protect the security of the USSR and its allies."

The people to whom these words are addressed would do well to listen attentively to them. They express the adamantine will of all Soviet people.

U.S. ARMS STANCE 'UNACCEPTABLE' AT GENEVA TALKS

LD102348 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 10 Jul 83

[Excerpts] The position of the Reagan administration at the talks on nuclear weapons in Europe is in fact focused on nothing but the deployment of new American medium-range missiles in Western Europe late this year at all cost. Among the methods the White House is using to block the negotiations is its refusal to consider the nuclear forces of Britain and France in the total nuclear potential of NATO in Europe. Our commentary is by Vladimir Kazanskiy. He writes tne following:

The American delegate at the Geneva talks refused to see nearly 300 nuclear warheads and various delivery vehicles possessed by Britain and France. Meanwhile, all of them are targeted on the Soviet Union and its allies. What's more, NATO continues to modernize and build up its nuclear potential in Europe. The United States claims that the Anglo-French neclear weapons, including 162 missiles, are insignificant and should not therefore be included into the general balance of nuclear weapons in Europe. Yet if this is really the case, why does the White House refect the Soviet proposal to have no more than 162 missiles in the same class also on the Soviet side?

The point is that by deploying its new medium-range missiles in close proximity to the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Treaty countries, the United States hopes to attain military supremacy. The United States is seeking to build a considerable additional first-strike potential. Even American experts admit that the new missiles the United States intends to site in Europe are a weapon of first-strike and aggression. the latest issue of the American BULLETIN OF ATOMIC SCIENTISTS contains evidence to this effect. The United States now wants to further increase the NATO nuclear potential, to secure itself a monopoly by siting at the doorstep of the Soviet Union nuclear weapons which can reach targets deep inside Soviet territory, while the Soviet Union does not have a comparable potential anywhere in the vicinity of the United States. It is to achieve these aims that the American side comes out with unacceptable demands at the talks, hoping to torpedo them and start installing its missiles.

These are extremely dangerous plans and their realization would put Europe and the whole of the world at the threshhold of a nuclear conflict. Everything must be done to prevent these plans from being carried out. As the Soviet leader said at his meeting with Federal Germany's Chancellor Helmut Kohl last Tuesday, we seek to bring down sharply the level of nuclear confrontation in Europe and this, we feel, should be done on the basis of equality and equal security.

DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE ENDS; PROMOTES DETENTE

LD101951 Moscow TASS in English 1940 GMT 10 Jul 83

[Text] Vienna July 10 (TASS) -- A meeting of the organizing committee for a second world conference-dialogue on problems of disarmament and detente has closed here today. The conference-dialogue is to be convened on the initiative of the international forum for liaison of peace forces.

The session of the organizing committee was attended by representatives of various political parties and public organisations from Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Britain, Guinea-Bissau, Greece, India, Canada, Colombia, Poland, the USSR, the USA, Switzerland and other states and a number of international organizations. The participants in the meeting pointed out that the threat of nuclear destruction has never been so serious. If the plans for the deployment in Europe late this year of new medium-range missiles are implemented, the situation will further aggravate.

In these conditions, the members of the organizing committee stressed in their speeches, it is particularly important to develop in every way possible actions contributing to the prevention of nuclear war, for disarmament and detente, strengthening of peace. The second world conference-dialogue on problems of disarmament and detente is scheduled to be held on November 14-17, 1983.

SED, PZPR CC POLITBUROS APPROVE MOSCOW MEETING

PM102055 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jul 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS reports: "Full Approval"]

[Text] Berlin, 6 Jul -- The SED Central Committee Politburo and the GDR Council of Ministers have approved in full the results of the meeting in Moscow of the socialist states' leading party and state figures, and the activity at this meeting of the GDR delegation headed by E. Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council.

The SED Central Committee Politburo and the GDR Council of Ministers, states a report which has been published here, note the enduring significance of the joint statement by the Moscow meeting participants. This document, in line with the Prague Political Declaration of the Warsaw Pact states, again reaffirms the socialist states' principled stance aimed at countering by all available means the militarist policy of the most aggressive circles of the United States and NATO and halting the world's threatened slide toward a nuclear catastrophe.

The socialist states, the report notes, cannot look on inactively while the most aggressive imperialist circles, and especially the United States, not only continue but even escalate their course toward disrupting the military balance, thus threatening the cause of peace. In view of the sharp exacerbation of the situation, the socialist countries discussed how international developments could be directed back onto the path of the relaxation of tension and how an end to the arms race and progress toward disarmament, and primarily disarmament in the nuclear arms sphere, could be achieved.

The SED Central Committee Politburo and the GDR Council of Ministers regard the Moscow meeting and its results as evidence of the firm will of the fraternal parties and states to achieve still closer cohesion and strengthened unity. In conditions of the policy of confrontation and the arms race launched by the United States and NATO, as well as the imperialist states' increased attempts to exert pressure on the countries of socialism, the allied socialist states reaffirm their determination through joint actions to rebuff the threat to socialism and to preserve peace for all peoples.

The SED Central Committee Politburo and the GDR Council of Ministers again insistently point to the extreme danger to the life of the peoples of Europe and other regions which will arise in the event of the siting of new U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in the FRG, Britain, Italy, and other West European countries.

It is the belief of the Moscow meeting participant states that it is still not too late to avert this danger. The USSR's constructive proposals, which have the GDR's wholehearted support, are aimed at achieving a mutually acceptable agreement on this issue, which is important both for European and international security.

The GDR, the report stresses, again invites the FRG Government to revise its position and, proceeding from the interests of both German states and their special responsibility for peace, not to gamble with what has been achieved in the center of Europe in 38 years of peace.

Proceeding from the interests of peace and their own security, the GDR and its allies declare that in the event of the siting of U.S. missiles in West Europe they will take all steps necessary to preserve the military-strategic balance between the Warsaw Pact and NATO.

The SED Central Committee Politburo and the GDR Council of Ministers draw special attention to the proposals contained in the Moscow meeting's joint statement concerning the most pressing tasks in arms limitation and disarmament, and primarily strategic arms limitation and reduction, freezing the nuclear arms of all nuclear states, and banning the deployment of all types of weapons in space. They also include the offer to embark on practical examination of the proposal for a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of relations of peace between the Warsaw Pact and NATO states.

Warsaw, 7 Jul -- A joint session of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and the Presidium of the Polish Government, attended by representatives of the leadership of the Sejm and the Polish Council of State, has been held here.

The session's participants approved in full the results of the Moscow meeting of the socialist countries' leading party and state figures and the activity of the Polish delegation headed by W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers.

The session emphasized that the joint statement adopted in Moscow expresses the unity of the fraternal parties and states in their assessment of the present international situation and their shared desire to avert the threat of war and strengthen peace and the security of the peoples.

The development of the international situation posing a threat to peace is a consequence of the policy of confrontation conducted by the U.S. Administration and supported by its NATO allies. The aim of this course is to disrupt the balance of forces by means of an unprecedented arms race and includes the siting of U.S. missiles in West Europe. This policy is the result of the growing influence on Western countries' policy of conservative forces which question the political realities in the world and in Europe. A danger is also presented by mounting revanchist tendencies in the FRG.

The PZPR Central Committee Politburo, the report on the session says, calls for the threatening trends in the development of the present international situation to be pondered soberly and objectively, and points to the need to adopt urgent measures capable of fending off the threat of war and directing the course of events toward detente and the development of international relations on a sensible basis, taking into account the generally recognized principles of mutual security.

The PZPR Central Committee Politburo supports the joint proposals of the Warsaw Pact states and regards as indispensable the discontinuation of the arms race and progress toward disarmament, with special consideration being given to the elimination of the threat of a nuclear confrontation on the European continent.

The PZPR Central Committee Politburo emphasized that Poland will take the steps necessary to strengthen the socialist states' cooperation in the struggle for the implementation of the proposals advanced in the Warsaw Pact states' Prague Political Declaration and the joint statement adopted at the meeting in Moscow.

The Polish People's Republic expresses its solidarity with the world's antiwar movements and will contribute its share to the implementation of the socialist states' coordinated foreign policy for the sake of peace and the strengthening of detente.

'NEW ECONOMIC BLOCKADE' AGAINST CEMA STATES "IT

LD020902 Moscow TASS in English 0741 GMT 2 Jul 83

["Tool of U.S. Hegemonistic Policy" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 2 TASS -- The heightened attempts to arrange a new economic blockade of countries of the socialist community are the most striking manifestation of the U.S. leaders' irresponsible approach to problems of development of world economics and international cooperation, writes the journal INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in its July issue. The main aim of that policy, writes Professor N. Smelyov, the author of the article, is to deprive socialist countries of an access to technological and financial possibilities offered by the world market and thereby to undermine, to exhaust them economically. The U.S. Administration now views any, including economic, links with the East, predominantly as a tool in furthering its military-political aims.

That policy, the journal writes, has another obvious aim which can hardly be called as auxiliary: to weaken through purely political pressure U.S. main rivals in world markets -- West European countries and Japan for which traditional economic links with the East are of great significance.

If the U.S. Administratio will finally succeed in attaining a substantial reduction in economic East-West links, then Western Europe and Japan, not American companies, will be mainly affected. The U.S. share in trade exchange of CMEA member-countries with developed capitalist states amounts to less than 10 percent while the share of West European countries -- more than 75 percent. If Western countries reduced in 1982 and 1983 their industrial exports to the USSR 50 percent, that would bring to the West a reduction in the Gross National Product of approximately 15,000 million dollars a year. Not less than one million people are now working in Western Europe over implementation of Soviet orders.

Socialist countries, despite U.S. stubborn attempts to have world socialism economically isolated, do not intend to give up the course of reliable, equal and mutually beneficial cooperation with all states, which display sincere interest in such cooporation.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD101447 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0845 GMT 10 Jul 83

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Boris Andriyanov, All-Union Radio foreign political commentator; Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, member of the NOVOYE VREMYA editorial board; Vadim Nikolayevich Nekrasov, international observer for KOMMUNIST]

[Text] [Andriyanov] Hello, comrades. Taking part in our program today are: Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, member of the editorial board of the weekly NOVOYE VREMYA; and Vadim Nikolayevich Nekrasov, international observer for the journal KOMMUNIST.

Soviet-West German Talks

Soviet-West German talks were held this week during the Moscow stay of FRG Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl, who came at the invitation of the Soviet Government. In the course of this visit there was a continuation of the political dialogue, which has a rich history. You know, of course, that in about a month's time it will be the 13th anniversary of the signing of the historic Moscow Treaty between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. Over the elapsed time a lot has been done to strengthen trust between our peoples and to switch relations between the two countries on to a normal course on the basis of mutual respect and acknowlegement of the territorial and political realities which came about as a result of World War II and postwar development. In a word, experience in positive development of relations has accumulated. For this reason it is important not only to preserve but also to augment this experience. It was noted by the Soviet side in the course of the talks that our country's approach to relations with the FRG is founded on the principles of peaceful coexistence between states with differing social systems. Althoug we are separated by our world outlooks, the Soviet Union is against differences in ideology leading to irreconcilability in interstate relations.

During the meetings in Moscow a frank exchange of opinions took place on fundamental questions of security to Europe, as well as on the development of relations between the USSR and the FRG on a long-term, stable, and mutually-beneficial basis. The results of the talks were discussed at a session of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. As you know, it approved the principled position taken up by Soviet leaders at these meetings. It was noted that the talks and conversations permit the West German side to form a clear-cut conception of the fact that the Soviet Union is for further development of Soviet-West German relations based on the Moscow Treaty, which is in the interests of the peoples of both countries and in the interest of the whole of Europe. In the course of the talks and conversations Soviet leaders were fully justified in emphasizing what the implementation of NATO plans to deploy new American missiles in West Europe could lead to: This will seriously complicate the international situation, will make the danger of war many times greater for the FRG, and will have a negative bearing on Soviet-West German relations. In this connection the Soviet side voiced the hope that the FRG Government will consider the responsibility it bears in the situation in question and take up a realistic position on the issue, one in the interest of peace.

[Nekrasov] I do not think it would be an exaggeration to say that the whole world watched the course of the Moscow talks most intently. A Bonn representative for press liaison described them as complex and tense. The West German chancellor himself said of his conversation with Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov: This was a frank conversation conducted from firm positions. The contents of the Moscow talks fall, as it were, into two parts.

One was concerned with bilateral Soviet-German relations -- you have already said something about this, Boris Vasilyevich. The other part was the problem of European security -- and, if we are to be more precise about this, the issue of plans to station new American nuclear missiles in West Europe at the end of this year. West Germany, it can be said, stands at the center of these plans. As is known from reports in the Western press, the first consignments of cruise missiles are due to be deployed on British and Italian territory and Pershing-II missiles in West Germany on 1 January next year, under NATO plans.

The Pershings are one of the most modern types of weapon. These are those same first-strike missiles which Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov stressed in his conversation with Kohl would in essence signify the revival of the threat of war against the USSR being unleashed from German territory. Yes, despite the lessions of history, aggressive circles of American imperialism would not be adverse to using West German territory as a springboard for their adventurist policies which are capable of bringing disaster on the whole of mankind. And, if we can put it like this, there are those on the banks of the Rhein who are actively playing along with them in this.

[Andriyanov] Vadim Nikolayevich, it would probably be useful in this connection to recall what the Hamburg magazine STERN wrote, on the eve of the visit, on the subject of the present Bonn government's policies. In the view of that magazine, in security policies Chancellor Kohl regards himself exclusively as a representative of the Western alliance and as a true follower of U.S. President Reagan.

[Nekrasov] In point of fact, that is what he is, if one is to judge from the position taken up by the present governing coalition in Bonn. But I feel that one should not neglect to note that despite that there is a clearer realization in West Germany than there is across the ocean of what a war unleashed by Washington would mean for West Germany itself. Quite simply, as West German peace-fighters quite rightly point out, their country would cease to exist. But, returning to problems of safeguarding peace and the security of the peoples, I should like to emphasize this point: The fact is that Western, NATO, propaganda is currently so zealous that it quite often has the effect, one might say, of hypnotizing itself. On the eve of the visit this propaganda was hardly concealing its hopes that Kohl's hardline position, as they say, at the Moscow talks would force Moscow to waver and agree to concessions, that is, to unilateral disaramament. But why in fact were such hopes being voiced? In reality there was no reason for this. The Soviet Union has repeatedly warned that in the event of the missiles' stationing prompt and effective measures will be taken on our side to preserve the military-strategic balance. They tried to brush aside our warnings, so it was necessary to remind them again. This was done by Comrade Andropov in the course of his conversation with Kohl. This was also said by other representatives at the talks. If things go as far as deployment, Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov stressed, we shall not cede our position, we shall not weaken our defense; rather we shall take prompt and effective measures in response to guard the security of the USSR and its allies. So there you have it: The i's, as they say, have been dotted, and the t's crossed once more.

[Volskiy] It is to be hoped that the seriousness of our warnings will now be understood. I would even say that there are those who now understand.

[Nekrasov] In this connection there is an interesting nuance in the reactions to the Moscow meetings and talks, the wish expressed by international opinion that they might nevertheless have opened the way to normalization of international relations.

[Andriyanov] That is quite right, Vadim Nikolayevich, because the acute aggravation of the international situation is becoming ever more dangerous in nature. Washington makes no secret of what aim it is pursuing at the present time: to attain military superiority over the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact Organization. It hopes to attain this by relying primarily on stationing the new American nuclear missiles in West Europe.

Even now, though, there is reason to say that the strategists across the ocean have no intention of limiting themselves to the present stage of realizing their designs. In fact, the outlines of the next stage are becoming more and more clear. This is shown above all by the Williamsburg meeting of the capitalist seven. At this meeting the Reagan administration continued its attempts to exert active influence on its partners to subordinate not only the West Europeans, but other countries as well to Washington's dangerous line. This is why one forms the impression that the United States is moving towards setting up a global military-political coalition of all the leading capitalist countries, directed towards the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

U.S.-Asian Alliance

[Nekrasov] Yes, there is no small portion of truth in such judgments. It is worth bringing to mind, for instance, the statement by U.S. Secretary of State Shultz that the United States is undertaking a new strategy: a strategy of what they call global opposition to the Soviet Union. Moreover, this was said soon after the Williamsburg meeting where the NATO countries came out with a statement on military questions which was blatantly militarist in nature. Incidentally, this statement was signed by the leaders of France, which is not part of NATO's military organization, as is known, and also Japan, which is not a member of the North Atlantic bloc.

[Andriyanov] Well, as far as Japan is concerned, then for the first time in the history of that country the head of its government has signed such a blatantly militaristic Western manifesto, approving Washington's aggressive global strategy and its striving to attain military supremacy. This demostrative gesture cannot be seen as anything other than yet another step by Tokyo along the road to allying Japan with the Reagan administration's aggressive course. The noticeable expansion of Japan's contacts with NATO countries is confirmed by the position of official Tokyo, which was expounded in Williamsburg by Prime Minister Nakasone, who announced that Japan is politically tied to NATO.

[Nekrasov] However, juding from everything, Tokyo is in no hurry to tell the whole truth. They are in no rush to admit the faits accomplis in relations with the United States. To start with, they talked in Tokyo about friendly Japanese-U.S. ties, then about the alliance between them, and then they finally announced the common destiny of the two states. What this revolves around is now becoming more and more obvious.

[Andriyanov] Yes, well, it revolves around the intensification of Japanese-American military cooperation with all the consequences which emerge from it. A qualitative change is taking place in the so-called treaty on security concluded between the United States and Japan in 1960. Washington is drawing Japan more and more deeply into its world strategy, is turning it, like the NATO countries, into an advance nuclear spring board which has a clear anti-Soviet orientation. Incidentally, the admissions of authoritative Americans are also well known, to the effect that Japan is an important link in the nuclear strategy of the United States.

[Volskiy] Well, Boris Vasiliyevich, since we have now talked about this Pentagon strategy, then it is perhaps worthwhile to focus attention on the rapid adjustment of ties in the military field between Japan and South Korea.

[Andriyanov] All of this enters right into the same aggressive plans of American strategists. The United States has military-political agreements with both Japan and South Korea. Therefore the scheme now clearly consists of creating a Washington-Tokyo-Seoul triangle. Prime Minister Nakasone began preparations for this from the moment he became head of the Japanese Government. Moreover he carried out an unscheduled trip to Seoul before setting off for a visit to Washington. In this way, as yet secretly, the formation of an aggressive block in the Far East is being prepared under the aegis of the United States. It will be directed not only against the Soviet Union, but also against other countries in that region.

[Nekrasov] Boris Vasiliyevich, Washington's schemes for knocking together aggressive anti-Soviet blocs are not limited to the Far East alone. Washington is also creating and strengthening its military outposts in a number of countries. According to American strategists' calculations, they will follow an arc-like course from the Far East, through Southeast Asia, the Indian Ocean, South Asia, and further to the West, embracing on the perimeter, the southern part and border of the Soviet Union.

[Andriyanov] Yes, it is towards such an arc that the Reagan administration is orientating itself, in accordance with its concepts both of limited nuclear war and other variants which it has equipped itself with in working out strategic plans. Washington has now proclaimed its new Asiatic policy. The point of this policy boils down to attempts by the United States to lay claim to some kind of special role as ruler over all affairs in Asia. On what basis? Only on the fact that the Asian Continent, so they say, has an important significance for the United States from a strategic and security viewpoint. And if this is how they are reasoning in Washington, the countries of Asia will have to orientate themselves only towards America if they become worried about their own fates.

What this Asian policy of the Washington administration means in concrete terms was clearly demonstrated by the recent trip of Shultz, the U.S. Secretary of State, to certain countries of Asia. In particular, he called on Thailand, spent time in the Philippines, went to Pakistan, and everywhere the secretary of state said again and again that the Asian countries must give the United States military bases on their territory for the sake of security interests. With the same aim, it is incumbent on them to link up their armed forces with the American military contingents located in the Asiatic region, to make a common cause for, as he announced, preserving universal peace, which the Soviet Union is supposedly threatening. This is the kind of trick that Washington has slipped into to disguise its aggressive schemes in the Asia-Pacific region.

[Volskiy] It is very clearly obvious that these are dangerous schemes. They are a strong reminder of, and entirely related to, Washington's calculations in West Europe, where the United States plans to deploy its new nuclear missiles. And in trying to tie Asian countries to its military chariot, the Reagan administration is striving to turn the states of this continent, just like West European countries, into hostages of its global nuclear strategy.

[Andriyanov] This is quite true. It is on this very point that the politicians across the ocean are counting. They are opposing that in the event of a global conflict unleashed by Washington, the main burden will fall on those regions of West Europe and the Asia-Pacific region where American nuclear weapons are deployed, while the United States itself will be able to remain on the sidelines, escaping with minimal losses. But you of course understand that these calculations are in vain. Do not let Washington entertain any illusions in this connection. As far as the aggressive aspirations of the United States are concerned, its course for the militarization of Asia, then here it truly presents a direct, real threat to the states of that continent.

The Soviet Union cannot look with indifference on Washington's aggressive policy, cannot relate with indifference to its military preparations in Asia, for two-thirds of the territory of our country is located on that continent. The Soviet Union cannot be an observer to the dangerous activization of the American military in the Pacific and Indian Oceans where vitally important transport routes linking European and Asian regions of our country are located. Of course, under these conditions we are forced to take the necessary measures to ensure our own security and the security of our allies, our friends.

[Nekrasov] Yes, in this situation, Boris Vasiliyevich, Washington and Tokyo, with its prompting, are exaggerating questions concerning the deployment of medium-range nuclear weapons in the eastern section of our country. Moreover, it is being portrayed in such a way as to show that supposedly it is our SS-20 missiles which are evidence of a threat which, as they say, now hangs over Japan from the Soviet Union.

[Andriyanov] Well, such propaganda tricks have no sparkle of originality, that's the first thing, and secondly, can they really seriously maintain in Washington and Tokyo that Soviet medium-ranged missiles in the eastern part of our country are not a counterbalance to the nuclear weapons which are located in American bases in the Far East, in Southeast Asia, in the Pacific and Indian Oceans? You probably remember what was said by Comrade Gromyko on the subject of this American weaponry. He said that these medium-range American weapons are capable of covering all of the Asian part of the Soviet Union, even the most northerly part of it, the Taymyr Peninsula. Therefore the matter of Soviet missiles on the Asian part of the territory of the Soviet Union is being fanned about by Washington for its own motives. It is putting forward demands for the liquidation of these missiles, seeking military supremacy by the United States over our country.

And if we talk about Japan, then its security is threatened not by the Soviet Union, but by the solidarity of Tokyo with the Washington nuclear strategy. As far as medium-range missiles in the eastern regions of the Soviet Union are concerned, then our position on this question is not a secret. The demand for one-sided reduction of these nuclear weapons can not be accepted. Our country has on more than one occasion announced its readiness to hold talks for the reduction of medium-range missiles in Asia on the basis of mutual accord. Moreover we are ready to hold such talks with those in whose hands such missiles are to be found aimed at the Soviet Union. The position is clear, clear to the utmost, and absolutely honorable, and it is dictated only by sincere concern for mutual security and durable peace.

Shultz, Bush Trips

[Volskiy] Talking today about the anti-Soviet policy of the Reagan administration one cannot fail to note the fact that two actions have been undertaken at the same time at different levels, so to speak. You, Boris Vasiliyevich, were speaking about Shultz' journey to Asia. At the same time -- and I stress -- at the same time, Vice-President Bush was traveling to Western Europe. These two journeys are of course closely linked. Both leading Washington figures have been trying not to reduce but to increase tension in Europe, as Bush was doing, while a characteristic feature of Shultz' Asian tour, over and above what you have just been saying, is the fact that he let it be understood, almost by spelling it out, that Washington will put obstacles in the way of the Pakistani-Afghan talks which are taking place through the mediation of the representative of the U.N. Secretary-General. That is to say, both in Europe and in Asia the Reaganites are pursuing the same line aimed at intensifying confrontation. And yet another, shall we say, episode in political life was a manifestation of this line, too. Shultz was preparing to return home when he suddenly received an order from the White House not to return but to set off immediately for the Near East where he visited Israel, Lebanon, Syria, and then Egypt and Jordan within a matter of days.

[Andriyanov] Dmitriy Antonovich, there have been reports in the American press that Reagan received some kind of secret information which persuaded him to send Shultz to the Near East.

[Volskiy] But it is more or less clear, without any secret information, what pushed Washington into taking that step: It was an attempt, as they say, by hook or by crook, to impose its own plans for this region. In the first place it is a question of the Reagan plan which was put forward last year, a plan which was worked out after the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, after the attack upon the Palestinians. The main feature of this plan is that it deprives the Arab people of Palestine of the right to self-determination and to the creation of their own independent state, and it ignores the PLO, I would recall that as long ago as 1947 the UN General Assembly passed a resolution envisaging the creation of two states, an Arab state and a Jewish state, in the place of the former British mandate territory of Palestine. The United States, too, voted in favor of this resolution, and no one has rescinded it. Now the Americans and Israel want to do away with the Palestine problem altogether, trying to make use of the differences which have been observed and which have become more acute in the Fatah Palestinian military organization and in the Palestine liberation movement in general. They want to drive a wedge between the PLO and Syria, and they launch other similar maneuvers, too. Evidently the reports of the flareup of these differences, which are clearly being deliberately built up by the Western press, have also pushed the White House into sending Shultz to the Near East again.

[Andriyanov] Dmitriy Antonovich, in the United States they want to impose upon the Arabs not just the Reagan plan, which you mentioned, but also approval of the capitulatory agreement which Washington and Tel Aviv have imposed upon the Lebanese Government.

[Volskiy] Of course. I would say that all this is a multi-stage operation that began under Carter at Camp David and is continued by the Reagan administration. For what difference is there between the Near East policy of the present administration, which worked out this agreement, or rather which helped in working it out, and the policy of the Carter administration? The fact that under Reagan it is not political pressure under the Arabs which is being made of paramount importance, as was the case under Carter, but military pressure. Just judge for yourselves: Following the invasion of Lebanon, Israel, with the obvious encouragement of the United States, has not ceased threatening Syria with war. At the same time Washington itself has been building up its military presence in Lebanon. You know that the first contingents of the specially trained U.S. Rapid Deployment Force are stationed there as part of the NATO countries' multi-national forces. Taking part in the multi-national forces along with the Americans are French, British, and Italians. And Middleton, the American military observer, considers that they might possibly have to take part in fighting if the fighting in Lebanon is resumed, and that reinforcements might even have to be taken to Lebanon from NATO countries.

[Andriyanov] But not very far from the Near East, in the Republic of Chad, the NATO bloc is operating in a more or less open way.

[Volskiy] That is quite right, it is, more or less open. It is not that the mechanisms of the bloc have officially been set in motion, it is, so to speak, on the basis of the individual involvement of two NATO powers, the United States and France. And so a kind of game with allocated roles is now being played out in Chad. They want to turn the civil war which is taking place in that ravaged and long-suffering country into an international conflict. The French are drawing Zaire into it and their own former colonies, like the Central African Republic, and are even preparing to send their own French troops under some cover or other.

Washington, meanwhile, is urging the Sudan and Egypt to interfere; it is beginning maneuvers by the Rapid Deployment Forces near Africa and in the Near East, and finally, it is staging provocations against Libya, a country neighboring Chad, which they are baselessly trying to accuse of being involved in the internal, civil war in Chad. But of course, Paris and Washington are each pursuing their own imperial aims. The contradictions between them are obvious. But when it is a question of strengthening the general position of neocolonialism in Africa they act together, as they are currently doing.

Madrid CSCE Meeting

[Andriyanov] I think that now, comrades, we ought to return from the Continent of Africa to Europe, and to talk about our own European affairs. Unlike the Soviet-American talks in Geneva, a much more favorable situation is coming into being at the meeting in Madrid, the meeting of states participating in the Helsinki CSCE. The impression is being created that in places where it is not just the United States which is taking part in talks on the Western side but other countries too, better prerequisites are created for the search for mutual understanding and acceptable accord.

[Nekrasov] There is nothing at all surprising in this, Boris Vasiliyevich. It is no secret that the Madrid meeting from the very outset did not enjoy Washington's favor. The Reagan administration quite simply wanted under various pretexts to bury it quickly in order thereby to rid itself once and for all of the policy of detente and to untie its own hands. But it did not manage to do so, and was prevented in this not just by ourselves, the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, but other Western countries prevented it as well, primarily, of course, the neutral and nonaligned ones taking part in the Madrid meeting. As you know, the Madrid talks were extremely long. But Washington did dare not to break them off. That would have been too much of a self-relevation. Moreover, Washington's hand was heal back the whole time by other Western countries. It is understandable why. Peoples which have experienced for themselves the beneficial effect of the process of detente did not want and do not want to give it up, and hope that detente will be preserved and strengthened. Adding up the preliminary results of Madrid, one can say, therefore, that the will of the European peoples for the preservation and continuation of the Helsinki process is ultimately gaining the upper hand.

[Andriyanov] Many of the events that we have touched upon with you today confirm just how complicated and difficult is the situation in the world arena. This kind of situation raises for all states and all peoples the question of how one can prevent any further dangerous development, prevent the world from sliding towards disaster. The leaders of seven European socialist states made a statement about this at the recent meeting in Moscow. Moreover, they did not confine themselves to raising this question, but gave a clear reply to it, having put forword a broad program of action for removing the military threat. Acting in a spirit of cohesion and unity, the fraternal countries of socialism are following a confident course. Recognizing their duty to present and future generations, they are demonstrating not with words, but action, that in our era it is socialism that is the most consistent champion of healthy initiatives in international relations, and the truest defender of the interests of detente and peace, the interests of every people and the whole of mankind. At this point we conclude our meeting at the roundtable. We thank you for your attention, esteemed comrade listeners. Good-bye. All the best to you.

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: QUESTIONS & ANSWERS'

LD081829 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 8 Jul 83

["International Situation -- Question and Answers" program presented by Valentin Gubernatorov, not further identified, with international affairs journalists Eduard Vasilyevich Kovalev and Igor Petrovich Belyayev, and station commentator Boris Vasilyevich Andrianov]

[Excerpts][Gubernatorov] Hello, esteemed comrades. Like a unique type of mirror, our program's mailbag reflects your concerns and thoughts on world events. Of course, everyone is prompted to take up his pen for different reasons, just as the questions which you pose, and which we try to answer, differ. Nevertheless, there is one dominating theme in all the letters: anxiety over the destiny of mankind and the future of all those who are to live after us. Peace -- this is the word that recurs most often in your letters. Even though different people write it in differing hands, all of them put one meaning into this word: prevention of nuclear war and preservation of life on earth. It is for this very reason that the foreign policy of our party and government enjoys such firm support among Soviet people, as your numerous letters attest. We take the most active part in all enterprises connected with the security of peoples and maintenance of peace. We have put forward a whole series of peace initiatives in order to put an end to the threat of nuclear catastrophe. Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov recalled this once again in his conversation with FRG Chancellor Kohl on 5 July in the Kremlin. We demonstrate flexibility and even agree to compromise, where possible, in order to eliminate the reasons for the arms race and for possible conflicts.

Madrid, Geneva Meetings

Our position at the Madrid CSCE, at the Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva on nuclear arms limitation, and at the Vienna negotiations on reduction of forces and weapons in central Europe for instance, are proof of this. Many of you, comrades, write to ask us to relate in more detail how matters stand at present in Madrid, Vienna, and Geneva. Comrades (Blago) from Tula, (Glulin) from the Tatar ASSR village of Anukhva, (Goncharov) from the Moscow Oblast town of Belgorod, and many others ask us about this in particular.

Taking part in our program today is Eduard Vasilyevich Kovalev, international affairs journalist. Over to you, Eduard Vasilyevich.

[Kovalev] May I remind you that at the recent meeting in Moscow of party and state figures from seven socialist countries, stress was laid on the need for the Madrid conference to end as soon as possible with positive results. What needs to be done for this? As the head of the Soviet delegation emphasized at the latest plenary session, the way to success has always consisted in exerting maximum efforts, conducting negotiations in a businesslike manner and in a positive spirit, creating a favorable atmosphere for the progress of these negotiations and, in any event, undertaking no actions whatsoever that might hamper them. The head of the Soviet delegation recalled that, a few weeks before, the Soviet Union had already given its consent to a renewed final document in the form in which it was submitted by its authors, the neutral and nonaligned countries participating in the Madrid meeting. A number of Western delegations, however, in particular the U.S. delegation, failed to appraise to a sufficient degree this demonstration of the political will for agreement of the Soviet Union. They started to create new delays, demanding that new amendments be introduced and trying to win a few more moves from us, in spite of the fact that many Western powers at that time considered the Soviet initiative the sole possible way out of the deadlock that had by then developed.

Finally, a few days ago the Spanish Government, the host of the Madrid meeting, came out with a new initiative in search of a compromise. And at the last plenary session the representative of the Soviet Union did indeed declare that the Soviet delegation was ready to act within the framework of the Spanish proposal, in order at last to seek opportunities for a successful completion of the meeting. The Soviet Union expressed the hope that all partners of the meeting would also act in a constructive manner.

Commenting on the Soviet Union's position, the majority of observers at Madrid have over the last few days stressed that thanks to that very position a real hope has been created for successful and urgent completion of the Madrid meeting, which, incidentally, has been in session for several years. The situation that has come about now allows one to hope for a successful completion of the Madrid meeting, if political will toward this is finally shown by the Western powers, in particular the United States. Such a successful completion of the Madrid meeting, with the signing of a meaningful and balanced final document that should include a mandate for organization of a conference on confidence-building measures and disarmament in Europe, would undoubtedly be a step pointing the way to the future.

It should be noted that the compromise draft final document put forward in Madrid preserves the interests of all the participants. It is on this very basis that satisfactory results should be rapidly achieved.

[Gubernatorov] One would like to believe, Eduard Vasilyevich, that the successful completion of the Madrid conference will serve as a stimulus for the Vienna negotiations, too. I am talking about the negotiations on reduction of armed forces and arms in central Europe. The latest proposal of the socialist countries makes it possible to put an end to the fruitless discussions there and find mutually-acceptable solutions to disputed problems.

[Kovalev] As is known, the Soviet Union very recently put forward at the Vienna negotiations a draft treaty that can full well serve as the basis for further rapprochement on the fundamental issues that are as yet unresolved. Demonstration of political will for agreement in Vienna would allow greater stability and greater security to be attained in central Europe, and in Europe as a whole.

[Gubernatorov] On the part of the West, however, there is so far, so it seems, no evident desire to follow the Soviet Union's example.

[Kovalev] Indeed, Valentin Petrovich, the fact that the champions of the policy of force are virtually preparing to turn Europe into a region of maximum military-political tension is arousing particular concern. Let us take as an example the Geneva negotiations on nuclear arms limitation in Europe. While the Soviet Union is doing everything possible there to reach a just and mutually-acceptable agreement to curtail medium-range nuclear weapons, and -- may I remind you -- has more than once taken major steps toward meeting the other side half-way, the United States is merely giving the impression that it is taking part in the negotiations. It is generally acknowledged that the United States is putting forward deliberately unacceptable demands for the unilateral disarmament of the USSR, while at the same time making active preparations for the deployment of new American missiles in the FRG and a number of other Western European countries.

It is clear to all, however, that the realization of these plans by the American side will inevitably bring about an abrupt deterioration of the situation in Europe and throughout the world.

[Gubernatorov] Europeans have been waiting for good news from Geneva for a long time, but there just is none, unfortunately. The question arises: What is going on there, why is there no progress at these negotiations?

[Kovalev] This question is all the more valid in that the entire world knows about the steps undertaken by our country to reach the earliest possible agreement. I should like to point out, however, that for such an agreement to be possible, the desire of both sides, not just one of them, is needed. It is precisely the desire and the political will for an agreement which is lacking on the American side. The Americans endeavor to show their flexibility in words; they, you see, are ready to settle for any total number of nuclear warheads on medium-range missiles which would be equal for the United States and the Soviet Union -- 50, 100, or 300 units. To the non-specialist or the uninformed, this might even seem attractive: The equality of the sides seems to be guaranteed and the number of missiles can be reduced to a minimum by mutual desire. On examination, all this is nothing other than deception. One can convince oneself of this if one takes the trouble to analyze just what is concealed behind the juggling of figures mentioned.

In the first place, in citing equal numbers for both sides, the Americans in fact are conducting the matter in such a way that these numbers enable the Americans to increase their nuclear potential in Europe by the corresponding number of missiles. For the Soviet Union, this would mean destroying that part of its medium-range missiles exceeding the number deployed by the United States.

In the second place, the Americans are at the same time continuing to pretend that there are neither French nor British missiles on the NATO side. I remind you, however, that these number over 160, in fact, and if one counts warheads, as the West so loves to do, then there are several times more of them. The Soviet Union, of course, cannot fail to take these into account too.

The United States forgets about its own medium-range means which it already has in the European zone. These are in the order of 700 nuclear-weapon-carrying aircraft. And finally, as if trying particularly hard to make its position even more absurd and unacceptable to us, the United States insists in including in the general limit those Soviet medium-range missiles that are deployed in the eastern part of the Soviet Union and have nothing to do with Europe. This is as if we started to count the American missiles deployed in the Pacific Ocean or anywhere else.

After all this, is it surprising that the Geneva talks remain deadlocked?

[Gubernatorov] One must therefore conclude that this impasse has been consciously programmed by Washington in order to avoid an agreement, which might impede the deployment of new U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe.

[Kovalev] The Americans shrink from no deception in order to achieve this goal. They are evidently calculating that when the deception becomes clear to everyone, only the Europeans will have to pay the price, for by then the American missiles will already be in place there.

I should also like to draw listeners' attention to the following aspect: The politicians of the NATO countries constantly reiterate that the Soviet Union will allegedly make concessions in Geneva after the new American medium-range missiles have been brought into Western Europe. It should be said very precisely and clearly that this is a profound and dangerous error, and our leaders have on many occasions spoken of this. In his conversation with FRG Chancellor Kohl, Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov said: If things go as far as deployment of missiles, we shall not yield our positions nor weaken our defense, but we shall take timely and effective retaliatory measures to defend the security of the USSR and its allies. In such a situation, it is hard to understand what the FRG hopes to win from deployment of American missiles on its territory, from our retaliatory measures and over-saturation of central Europe with all types of weapons of mass destruction.

The adoption by us and our allies of immediate additional measures to strengthen our security and the creation by us of a counter balance to the new NATO military potential will lead to the reestablishment of equilibrium, of course, but a higher level of danger for the maintenance of peace. The responsibility for this will lie with the authors and executors of the present plans of NATO and the United States.

[Gubernatorov] Pavel Andreyevich Stukhalov, a regular listener from the town of Votkinsk, asks who controls U.S. nuclear weapons deployed in Western Europe. Perhaps it seems strange to you, Pavel Andreyevich, but control of U.S. nuclear weapons in West European states is the exclusive privilege of the United States. You might ask where is the logic. All sorts of things might enter the desperate heads in Washington. For example, if they give the order to push the launch button of their missiles in Great Britain, the British would then pay for the recklessness of their ally across the ocean. Unfortunately that is exactly how things stand. This cannot but worry the broad circles of the British public. By the way, emotions have been heated up in the British press about who should really control the 160 cruise missiles whose deployment in the British Isles the United States intends to begin at the end of this year.

To leave the right to decide the question of launching the missiles to the Americans, the MORNING STAR wrote in this connection, is equivalent to suicide. Indeed, the Pentagon strategists have so far not renounced their doctrine of limited nuclear war. This doctrine supposes the conduct of combat actions with the use of nuclear weapons primarily on the European Continent. It is understandable that millions of British people are alarmed at such a state of affairs and have demanded an explanation from the government. Do you know what Defense Minister Heseltine replied to many official inquires from representatives of the opposition parties, trade unions and anti-war organizations? Speaking on national television he said that the establishment of British control of the missiles in addition to American control would cost Great Britain 1 billion pounds sterling and therefore, he said, it was not worth changing anything. True, Heseltine tried to soothe public opinion by stating that the Americans would not launch the missiles without first informing the British prime minister. But these are, as they say, just good intentions. In reality, however, if a situation should arise in which the Pentagon considered it advantageous to make a first strike, U.S. missiles would be launched from Britain or any other West European country, and this would be on orders not from London, Bonn, or Rome but from Washington. Apart from the fact that such prospects turn the West European countries into direct hostages of the United States -- for a strike in response is inevitable -- the Americans' single-key control over the nuclear missiles is also an infringement of the national sovereignty of these states.

Lebanese Peace Agreement

[Gubernatorov] Comrade Panin from Lipetsk Oblast writes to us that we often broadcast over the radio that Israel has imposed a peace treaty on Lebanon. I do not understand, he writes, how such a treaty can be imposed if it was signed by the head of state and approved by the government on Lebanon's part. If it has been approved it means that the treaty suits them. The same question is posed by a listener from Orel, Comrade Bakina. I have asked Igor Petrovich Belyayev, journalist on international affairs, doctor of history, to answer it. Igor Petrovich, please.

[Belyayev] Well, in the first place it should be stressed that it is not a question of a treaty but an agreement. If one is to touch on the main thing that is contained in the question, then the Munich agreement of 1938 was imposed on Czechoslovakia as a result of a plot between Hitler and several West European powers who wanted to direct him against the USSR.

Let me remind you that the Munich agreement was signed by Czechoslovak President Benes and it was approved and ratified by all the state organs, so to say, of the republic. But from the very start it was clear that the agreement had been signed under pressure -- military-political pressure from Hitlerite Germany and Western Europe. I have in mind primarily Britain. Chamberlain wished by this means to sacrifice Czechoslovakia to Hitler and to direct his aggression towards the East.

And now, in essence, the same thing has happened. A considerable part of the territory of Lebanon has been occupied by the Israeli army. Talks on the conclusion of a new agreement were conducted, in essence, if you wish, with a pistol pressed to the head of the Lebanese people, if one can say that. Naturally, the formal fact, in itself, that the new agreement was approved by the Lebanese Government and that parliament voted for President Amin al-Jumayyil to ratify this agreement, this does not at all show that the agreement that was reached, I repeat, under military-political pressure not only from Israel but also from the United States -- I shall speak of its role a bit later -- is legitimate. It is illegal. That is, it in essence infringes the sovereignty of Lebanon; it is a one-sided agreement.

[Gubernatorov] But the imposing of a one-sided agreement is a crime in international practice.

[Belyayev] This crime, in essence, has been carried out before our very eyes.

[Gubernatorov] Indeed, when you read through the text of the Israeli-U.S.-Lebanese agreement you are struck by the fact that it has many and varied juridical clauses, articles, and references, but it is quite clear that the Israeli army does not now intend to leave Lebanon and that consequently the occupation continues. This is also an international crime as stated in applicable international conventions.

[Belyayev] And this occupation will continue. Moreover, now everything is being connected with the withdrawal of Syrian troops and Palestinian military formations from the Al-Biqa' Valley. But the Syrian troops just like the military formations of the PLO are in Lebanon on the mandate of the Arab League. This mandate on 26 July 1982 was not extended, but it has not been annulled, and consequently the last word in this case belongs to the Arab League. If one recalls that the Lebanese patriotic forces are now engaged in a struggle against the Israeli occupation the like of which has never happened during all the previous Israeli-Arab wars, then, as far as I can see, the very situation excludes the possibility that this agreement can be recognized as just.

[Gubernatorov] Igor Petrovich, you promised to speak in particular about the role of the United States of America in the signing of this agreement.

[Belyayev] It seems to me that with the appearance of the new agreement we can state that this country has gone over from the role of so-called disinterested mediator, which the U.S. press has been asserting endlessly of late, to the role of direct accomplice of Israeli aggression. For, Moshe Arens, the present Israeli defense minister, not so long ago said openly that the United States of America knew about the war that was being prepared and moreover gave its sanction, so to say, to its start and was, in essence, an accomplice in this war literally from 6 June 1982.

For what reason? Well, primarily to crush the national patriotic forces of Lebanon, to crush the Palestinians using the Israeli soldiers and then to go over to consolidate an active U.S. military presence in that country. This is already a part of the strategic plan which the Pentagon is nurturing not only with regard to the Near East but also with regard to the Middle East and western Asia.

A system is being created which is now being called sometimes a defensive system and other times a military system, but its aim is for this vast subregion of the Near and Middle East to be under the control of the United States of America.

[Gubernatorov] Igor Petrovich, our listener Shevelev from Kamchatika asks us: Israel committed its crime in Lebanon as they say, in broad daylight, where everyone could see. Why did no one stop this aggression? Is there no force that can oppose the forces of Israel and the United States of America?

[Belyayev] Well, in the first place, I would word the question slightly differently. There was a force that stood up against Israeli aggression. This was, first of all, the units of the national patriotic forces of Lebanon, the PLO military formations, and it was precisely the latter that conducted a heroic struggle to the very moment when, on the decision of the Executive Committee of the PLO, they left Beirut in order to prevent the destruction of this Arab capital city by Israeli artillery and Israeli tanks. It seems to me that for the first time in the whole history of the Israeli-Arab wars, in the whole 35 years of the existence of the State of Israel, the military machine of that country came up against such, I would say, heroic and active opposition. For, the war is continuing and consequently it is today too early to say that no one stood up against aggression.

As far as anyone coming out in defense of Lebanon or the PLO, then, esteemed comrades, the point here is not only that some people would like and some would not like to give the necessary help. It is not possible to consider that some country has some sort of fire brigade able to extinguish international crises of conflagrations. Lebanon appealed for help, to prevent the destruction of Beirut and the destruction of Lebanon, to the Western powers, to the United States and to certain West European countries. This help requested by the Lebanese Government has been given. U.S. Marines are in Lebanon. In Beirut you can meet French and Italian soldiers, and British units appeared not so long ago. That is, in brief, the West giving aid. But with what aim? With the aim of consolidating U.S. military presence. The appearance of Marines is now being demonstrated in practice as a claim for their eternal presence in Lebanon. It is not for nothing that Beirut has been chosen the center for CENTCOM, the Central Command whose operations spread over 19 countries of the Near East and western Asia. All of these innovations by U.S. imperialism in the Near East are being consolidated under the cover of arguments about help to Lebanon and its people.

As far as giving a rebuff to U.S.-Israeli aggression, then here also it is not possible to consider that everything has gone smoothly for the aggressor. A whole range of resolutions has been adopted at the United Nations, in particular in the Security Council. Unfortunately, Israel is not fulfilling them. But violations of the decisions of the Security Council, nonfulfillment of its resolutions, can nonly last so long, and in the end efforts to rebuff aggression in the Near East are increasing and it seems to me that in Israel itself people are thinking about this, thinking of retribution for the crime. And in addition to that, today one must forget one other thing -- the scale of the anti-war struggle. Anti-war demonstrations on the streets of Tel Aviv and other Israeli towns all show that Israel's war in Lebanon has given rise to very strong processes which are now rending Israeli scoeity. Today it is not so easy for Begin to start a new war because he must take into account everyting that is happening in his own country and in other countries around Israel and throughout the world.

[Gubernatorov] Many thanks, Igor Petrovich.

ILO Discussed

Listener Pastukhova from the town of Vyazniki, Vladimir Oblast, asks to be told about the ILO, what it engages in and what questions it solves.

The ILO was created in 1919 at the Paris Peace Conference as an autonomous organization under the League of Nations. Since 1946 it has operated as a specialized institution of the United Nations. The aims of the organization are to improve living and work conditions and to promote economic and social stability. The ILO drafts international conventions on such questions as pay, the workday, minimum working age, social insurance, and working conditions for various categories of workers. The ILO's activity is financed by 144 states which are members of this organization.

The USSR participates actively in the work of the ILO, defending the genuine interests of the working people. Our country has ratified its most important conventions. The USSR also favors the ILO's adoption of conventions on the right to work, on the defense of workers at the enterprises of multinational corporations, on workers' participation in the national planning of economic and social development, and on the defense of the workers' incomes in conditions of inflation and unemployment.

Meanwhile, representatives of the governments and business circles of Western countries constantly make attempts to isolate the ILO from urgent problems of the modern world. This primarily concerns the struggle against the arms race, the growth of unemployment, and the organization's participation in solving problems of social and economic development in the Third World. In spite of the attempts by the West to keep the ILO away from the outside world, in recent years the organization has noticeably stepped up its discussion of topical international questions. Thus, in 1974 the ILO general conference adopted a resolution condemning Israel for its policy of discrimination and racism and for violating trade union rights and liberties on occupied Arab territories. In 1975 the PLO was granted observer status in the ILO. By the way, at that time, the United States, under pressure from the reactionary bosses of the AFL/CIO and representatives of Zionist circles who did not like all of these actions by the ILO, left the organization. In 1981 the ILO adopted a declaration on apartheid and a supplement to it which outlines an extensive program of struggle against this shameful phenomenon of our days. The ILO publishes a number of periodicals, thematic monographs, research, and statistics. The organization is headquartered in Geneva.

Japanese Militarization

[Gubernatorov] In a letter we received from Khabarovsk, listener Mikhail Tolstikh writes in part as follows: I have heard that in Japan there is a constitution in force which bans war, but the press is increasingly frequently carrying reports that this country is preparing for war. How can these things be compatible? Other listeners are also interested in questions concerning the militarization of Japan. I shall ask our commentator, Boris Vasiliyevich Andrianov to talk about this problem.

[Andrianov] Comrade Tolstikh is indeed right. Japan's militaristic preparations simply are not compatible with the anti-war articles of the basic law of that country. I shall permit myself to quote the ninth article of the Japanese Constitution. Here is what it says: Genuinely striving for international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people for all time renounce war as the sovereign right of the nation and also the threat or use of armed force as a means of solving international disputes. To achieve the aims pointed out in the preceding paragraph, this article goes on to say, never in the future will land, sea, or air forces be created, nor any other means of waging war. The right of the state to wage war is not recognized.

I shall note that the Japanese Constitution currently in force was adopted in 1947, but now, contrary to the anti-war article of that constitution, the Japanese ruling circles have quite consciously adopted a firm course of militarizing the country. This year implementation began of an extensive military program. It is calculated for 5 years. When this program has been implemented, Japan will occupy the first place in military might among the states which do not possess nuclear weapons. But, judging by everything, even such laurels in the long term no longer satisfy Tokyo's militaristic circles. The Japanese generals insistently demand a review of the 5-year program with a view to increasing it since, according to them, it is too moderate and does not accord with the contemporary international situation.

The Japanese military department openly states its intention of carrying out a radical modernization of all its armed forces which to this day in that country have the formal name of Self-Defense Forces.

Already militaristic tendencies are having an increasing effect on the policy of the ruling circles which express the interests of the big-shot monopolists. They plan to bring the country's military potential into line with its growing economic might.

[Gubernatorov] What is behind these plans?

[Andrianov] As far as one can see it is the intention to turn Japan into a military power capable of carrying out the role of conductor of U.S. interests in the Asia-Pacific region, and also the striving at the same time to satisfy its growing expansionist appetites.

[Gubernatorov] Tokyo is not yet saying that openly. Moreover, they are trying in every way to mask their policy of creeping militarism.

[Andriyanov] According to the AUSTRALIAN FINANCIAL REVIEW Japan is spending considerably more on military aims than is recorded in the account books. At the same time Masaharu Gotoda, chief secretary of the Japanese cabinet of ministers, is trying to deny that militaristic tendencies are becoming more active, groundlessly asserting that the increase of Japan's defense capability is being implemented within the framework of the Constitution and, allegedly, does not go beyond self-defense and the three non-nuclear principles. But as far as concerns the Constitution, it totally forbids Japan from creating any armed forces at all. But they exist, albeit as we have already said, in a camouflaged form.

Tokyo is beginning to extend very widely the limits of so-called self-defense. Japanese Prime Minister Naksaone himself states his resolve to defend maritime and air borders situated thousands of miles from the shores of Japan, and promises to block important international straits to shut in the Soviet fleet in its Far Eastern ports.

None of this can be linked to possible actions stemming from the interests of Japan's self-defense. Also unconfirmed by the facts are the statements by official Tokyo about the observation of the three non-nuclear principles: not to produce, not to acquire, and not to possess nuclear weapons. A few days ago Major General Donnelly, commander of U.S. forces in Japan, cynically admitted that he considered the refusal of the Japanese authorities to bring nuclear weapons into the country to be an empty declaration. It is time for the Japanese to agree to the storing of nuclear warheads in our stores, he stressed. According to the logic of the Japanese rulers it seems that it is also done with the aim of self-defense. But against whom should Japan defend itself? Against the USSR, Tokyo asserts. But our country has never demonstrated hostility to our Far Eastern neighbor. Nonetheless the Japanese ruling circles have resorted to deliberate deception by putting into circulation the propaganda myth about the so-called growing military threat from the USSR.

The advocates of the militarist course try to outdo each other at times with the most foolish inventions. As Japanese Professor (Shujiman) wrote, matters have gone so far as the stupidity that there has already been talk about plans for the landing of Soviet troops on Hokkaido. Naturally, these plans were born only in the minds of idle Japanese propagandists. Nonetheless, under the pretext of rebuffing an external threat, Hokkaido, the most northerly island of the Japanese archipelago -- that is, the part of Japanese territory nearest to the USSR -- is being turned into an increasingly powerful military base. Officially Tokyo circles do not tire of voicing their fears about the USSR's intentions in the Far East. But no matter how they try to distort our country's foreign policy there, the USSR consistently implements a course of good-neighborly relations with Japan on the basis of mutually-advantageous cooperation in all spheres. However, the USSR's peaceful initiatives do not meet with a worthy response from Tokyo.

[Gubernatorov] Thank you, Boris Vasiliyevich.

'IDEOLOGICAL SABOTEURS' FLOAT ALI AGCA CHARGE

LD091434 Moscow TASS in English 1248 GMT 9 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 9 TASS -- TASS commentator Vyacheslav Muravyov writes: It has been proved with the help of incontrovertible evidence that the charges that some socialist countries were "involved" in the assassination attempt on Pope John Paul II are nothing more than absurd insinuations. But ideological saboteurs have not stopped their provocative activity and are now trying to float another bad-smelling "sensation." The Western wire services have given full play to a statement by terrorist Mehmed Ali Agca accusing the Soviet Union of having had a hand in preparing the assassination attempt.

Who and for what purpose needs to promulgate the deliberate lie now once again? The six-month inquest, during which Italian investigators, acting in concert with Western special services, tried to prove something that cannot be proved, has shown that there are absolutely no facts to bear out, directly or indirectly, the socialist countries' complicity in the heinous crime.

Moreover, burgeoning evidence has surfaced which, the Bulgarian news agency has emphasised, shows that the so-called "case of Antonov" is a striking example of the subversive ideological activity which is being conducted uninterruptedly by Western intelligence and propaganda services against the countries of the socialist community.

Facts indicate also that this case of subversive propaganda can be traced to those who back repressive regimes like the ones in Chile and Guatemala, who patronise Israeli aggressors and terrorists, and who have got accustomed to daily violence in their own country. It is precisely this that can be used to explain why the ideological saboteurs should need to drag out the thread-bare propaganda canard and try to get it flying once again: They need this to prevent world public attention from focussing on the true organisers and inspirers of acts of terrorism, who are closely linked with neofascist circles and the American CIA, which, as has been proved conclusively, has sponsored the fabrication about socialist countries' "complicity" in the assassination attempt on Pope John Paul II.

It is likewise clear that fresh attempts to amplify the propaganda outcry pursue also broader aims which the U.S. Administration has set itself in its "crusade" against the socialist community, namely those of kindling, by means of slander, ill-will towards the Soviet Union and other socialist states, and sow more seeds of distrust between East and West at this already tense moment in the international situation.

MATERIALS ON DPRK FREINDSHIP TREATY ANNIVERSARY

PRAVDA Cites NODONG SINMUN

PM081516 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jul 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Important Event"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 6 Jul -- The conclusion of the Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance Between the USSR and the DPRK was an important event in the struggle by the two countries' peoples against imperialism and for the victory of the cause of socialism and communism, NODONG SINMUN writes in connection with the 22d anniversary of the signing of that document which occurs today.

In the years that have elapsed, the Workers' Party of Korea Central Committee organ notes, the relations of friendship and cooperation between the Soviet and Korean peoples have strengthened and developed. In the international arena the countries advocate peace in Asia and throughout the world.

The fraternal Soviet people, under CPSU leadership, are striving for great successes in implementing the 26th CPSU Congress decisions and are actively struggling to defend peace and security in Europe and throughout the world.

The Korean people wish the Soviet people even greater successes in that struggle. They value their friendship and cohesion with the Soviet people and will strengthen and develop them even more on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, NODONG SINMUN stresses.

Moscow Soiree 5 Jul

PM081514 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jul 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS Report: "Significant Date"]

[Text] A soiree to mark the 22d anniversary of the USSR-DPRK Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance was held in Moscow on 5 July. It was attended by Kwon Hui-Kyong, DPRK ambassador to the USSR.

Moscow Meeting 6 Jul

SK071104 Moscow in Korean to Korea 1130 GMT 6 Jul 83

[Excerpts] The date of 6 July marks the 22d anniversary of the signing of the Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance Between the Soviet Union and the DPRK. On this occasion, a commemorative meeting was held at the Moscow external friendship hall.

The meeting was attended by representatives of the working people in Moscow, activists of the Soviet-Korean Friendship Society, officials of the DPRK Embassy in Moscow, including Ambassador Kwon Hui-kyong.

Comrade Beletskiy, vice chairman of the Central Committee of the Soviet-Korean Friendship Society and vice minister of the Ministry of the Maritime Fleet, spoke at the meeting.

Amity Society Sends Greetings

SK070703 Moscow in Korean to Korea 1130 GMT 6 Jul 83

[Text] Comrade (Tanaknov), chairman of the Central Committee of the Soviet-Korean Friendship Society, sent a message of congratulations to Comrade (Kim Yong-hoe), chairman of the Central Committee of the Korean-Soviet Friendship Association.

The message of congratulations reads: The important (?document) based on complete (?equality) and (?mutual respect) has elevated Soviet-Korean relations to a new stage. [Word indistinct] constitutes an important factor in maintaining peace and security on the Korean peninsula and it the Far East.

Marking the 22d anniversary of the conclusion of the treaty, the Soviet people hope that the fraternal Korean people will attain great success in socialist construction, in carrying out the tasks put forward at the Sixth Workers Party of Korea Congress and in the struggle to reunify [word indistinct] on a democratic basis.

IZVESTIYA ACCUSES JAPANESE FISHERMEN OF SPYING

PM081218 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Jul 83 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by V. Kirillov under the rubric "Caught Red-Handed": "On the Japanese 'Fisherman' and the Espionage 'Fish'"]

[Text] The two green lights which flashed on the signal mast of the Soviet fishing patrol cutter meant: Cut the engine. There was nothing for the Japanese schooner "Kasuga Maru No 88" to do but comply with the order. The incident occurred in Soviet territorial waters of Zelenyy Island, which is in the Lesser Kuril chain....

Every year over 4,000 Japanese ships enter the USSR's 200-mile fishing zone with the Soviet authorities' permission. Japanese fishermen, in accordance with the licenses issued to them, fish a strictly set number of plaice, shrimp, squid, and other fruit of the sea. And the "Kasuga Maru No 88" seemed to be one of these ships and its captain an ordinary fisherman. But that was only at first glance. They had noticed from the fishing patrol cutter that the "Kasuga Maru No 88" was keeping suspiciously close to the Soviet islands and, moreover, in areas of water in which it is well known the fish yield is by no means plentiful. "Perhaps the "Kasuga Maru No 88" is poaching sea urchin?" the fishing inspector reasoned. "After all, there are always more near the shore."

What was the Soviet fishing inspector's surprise when he recognized an "old friend" in the luckless captain of the "Kasuga Maru No 88."

Some time ago Tsunaeshi Matsuda (that is what the captain of the "Kasuga Maru No 88" was called) had delivered to Soviet shores on a hired schooner an unusual passenger disguised as a "crew member." He was one Yozo Soga who worked at the U.S. "cultural center" in Niigata City. He had come to the shores of the Soviet Kuril Islands on instructions from the U.S. and Japanese special services to take secret photographs and prepare an "eyewitness account" of the Soviet shore zone and the installations there. Yozo Soga's masters rated highly his gifts as a spy, which he had once shown in obtaining compromising information on local politicians. So it was by no means fortuitous that their choice fell on him.

The competent Soviet authorities deported the freelance "journalist," as Yozo Soga described his profession, and after investigation they notified Captain Tsunaeshi Matsuda that his conduct was intolerable and warned him of the possible dangerous consequences of "shuttle operations" of this kind with dubious passengers on board. And now there was another surprise meeting in Soviet territorial waters!

The search confirmed the fishing inspector's suspicions. The holds of the "Kasuga Maru No 88" were indeed full of sea urchins. And Captain Tsunaeshi Matsuda had to sign a protocol admitting illegal fishing for sea urchins and sabotaging stocks of this valuable catch in Soviet territorial waters. A twofold crime: violating the border and poaching.

With bowed head, Tsunaeshi Matsuda went to the boat lowered from the Soviet fishing patrol cutter.... At that moment a further hiding place was discovered in one of the "Kasuga Maru No 88's" holds. It contained spying apparatus designed to take secret photographs of Soviet territory. Five cameras with telephoto lenses, movie cameras, and numerous reels of exposed film attested irrefutably that in no way were the Japanese fishermen "fishing" for innocuous fish, but for espionage information.

[Within the body of the item IZVESTIYA prints a photograph captioned: "In the photograph: spying equipment and apparatus found in a hiding place on the Japanese fishing schooner 'Kasuga Maru No 88'."] The sea urchins were merely camouflage for the captain of the "Kasuga Maru No 88" and its crew. "If you are caught, you will be charged with illegal fishing, not espionage," Matsuda was told by the Japanese "experts" who sent him on such a dangerous trip.

During the investigation Tsunaeshi Matsuda confessed in full to espionage and named his accomplices. He described how he had been recruited by Shiro Ikeda, an employee of the Japanese public security investigation agency, who "specialized" in recruiting Japanese fishermen fishing close to the Soviet Union's shores. Tsunaeshi Matsuda got his just deserts. The story of the "fishermen and the fish" could be ended here. But it is apposite to cite the words of one of the "Kasuga Maru No 88" crew members, who stated: "I am not sorry for Tsunaeshi Matsuda. There are more than enough of these spies recruited in Japan on CIA instructions. I am sorry for the many hundreds of Japanese fishermen for whom fishing with the Soviet authorities' permission has always been of assistance in making ends meet and has saved from the financial difficulties threatening them. Now people like Tsunaeshi Matsuda may cast the shadow of suspicion on us all." And it is hard to disagree with the opinion of someone who really is an ordinary Japanese fisherman.

DRA'S KARMAL LEAVES IRKUTSK FOR ULAANBAATAR

LD082012 Kabul Domestic Service in Dari 1600 GMT 8 Jul 83

[Text] Babrak Karmal, general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee and president of the DRA Revolutionary Council, heading the high-ranking DRA party and government delegation, left Irkutsk Oblast in the Soviet Union at 0830 for Ulaanbaatar, capital of the People's Republic of Mongolia, at the invitation of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee and the Presidium of the People's Great Hural of the People's Republic of Mongolia. The BAKHTAR correspondent reports that after a short stopover in Tashkent, capital of Uzbekistan SSR, Karmal and his delegation arrived in Irkutsk at 1700 and spent the night there. At the regional airport Babrak Karmal and his delegation were welcomed by W. I. Sitnikov, obkom first secretary, Aleksey Yemelyanovich Sokolov, Chairman of the Irkutsk Oblispolkom, other party and government personalities of this region, (Togtoh), member of the Presidium of the People's Great Hural of the People's Republic of Mongolia, and the head of Mongolian Protocol. (Togtoh) and the head of protocol at the Mongolian Ministry of Foreign Affairs had come to Irkutsk in the Soviet Union to welcome Babrak Karmal and his delegation. The BAKHTAR correspondent reports that Babrak Karmal was seen off at Irkutsk Airport today by the secretary of the obkom, the chairman of the Irkutsk Oblispolkom and other government and party officials of this region.

USSR-DRA ECONOMIC COMMISSION ACTIVITIES OUTLINED

PM081509 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jul 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Cooperation Developing"]

[Text] The third session of the Soviet-Afghan Permanent Intergovernmental Commission on Economic Cooperation was held in Moscow 4-5 July. The commission approved the results of the Soviet and Afghan organizations' work on implementing bilateral agreements on economic and technical cooperation and trade. There was a detailed examination of questions of cooperation in the sphere of agriculture and irrigation, transport, power, the light and food industries, geological prospecting, and the training of national cadres. A protocol and a number of intergovernmental documents on questions of trade and economic cooperation were signed on the results of the session, which was held in an atmosphere of fraternal friendship and complete mutual understanding.

The USSR delegation was headed by Z. N. Nuriyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. The DRA delegation was headed by K. Abawi, deputy chairman of the DRA Council of Ministers and chairman of the DRA State Planning Committee. There was a talk between Ya. P. Ryabov, chairman of the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, and K. Abawi on 5 July. Questions of Soviet-Afghan economic and technical cooperation were discussed.

SHULTZ REMARKS DURING PAKISTAN VISIT SCORED

Backing for Rebels, Haq

PM081515 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 6 Jul 83 p 3

[TASS commentator I. Kolganov "Commentary": "The Emissary From the Banks of the Potomac"]

[Text] U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz has paid an official visit to Pakistan. "Forgetting" about diplomatic etiquette, the emissary from the banks of the Potomac

decided to take the bull by the horns right away and showed a heightened and patently unhealthy interest in Pakistan's neighbor, the sovereign country of Democratic Afghanistan.

First, the transatlantic visitor made a trip to (Nazir Bagkh) on the outskirts of Peshawar (North West Frontier Province), where a camp for so-called "Afghan refugees" -- Afghan counterrevolutionary rabble -- has been established on Pakistani soil with the consent and connivance of Ziaul Haq's military regime. Having made himself comfortable eastern-style on carpets beneath a colorful tent to face smiling mullahs and landowners, as well as Afghan basmaks who carry out armed raids on Afghanistan, the U.S. secretary of state extolled in every way the "brave army's struggle," which "is inspiring mankind."

One basmak ringleader, a certain (Nazir Malik), boasted to the visitor about how the bandits execute "their opponents" during armed attacks on Afghan territory, and how they "administer punishment to all those who fall into their hands." "You are not alone in your struggle," the U.S. secretary of state told him, having in mind Washington's official support in arms and money for the "fighters" against the legitimate DRA Government. With staggering cynicism, he wished "his brothers in the struggle for freedom" further successes in reprisals against the peaceful population of Afghanistan. Obviously moved by the exceptionally warm welcome, Shultz turned to the bandits and enthusiastically proclaimed: "The United States is on your side!" In response the cutthroats began to wail in unison: "Allah akbar!" which means "God is great." It turns out that the criminals, who are long ripe for the gallows, and Washington's emissary have both the same God and the same aims.

In accordance with his earlier planned itinerary, the head of the U.S. foreign policy department then went by military helicopter to the region of the population center of (Landi Kotal), which is situated 5 miles from the Afghanistan frontier, close to the strategically important Khyber Pass. An AP correspondent noted in his report from Peshawar that Shultz' visit to the Khyber Pass was aimed at demonstrating the United States' unconditional support for the military regime in Islamabad and for the undeclared war which the forces of imperialism and reaction are waging against the DRA.

One can fully concur with this. Numerous facts indicate that the United States is striving to turn Pakistan into its policeman in Southwest Asia and the Persian Gulf and also make use of Islamabad to exert pressure on those countries of the region which pursue an independent foreign policy aimed at strengthening peace and opposed to the threat of nuclear catastrophe.

Pakistani-Afghan Talks

LD092107 Moscow World Service in English 1430 GMT 9 Jul 83

[Commentary by news analyst Aleksandr Korolev]

[Text] While in Pakistan State Secretary George Shultz voiced skepticism about the latest round of Geneva talks between Pakistan and Afghanistan. He said they did not inspire any particular optimism. The participants in the talks are saying something quite different however. According to the official communique the foreign ministers of Afghanistan and Pakistan reaffirmed their conviction that it will be possible to surmount the remaining obstacles in the way of a political settlement, and Foreign Minister Sahabzada Yaqub Ali Khan is quoted as saying that the Afghan problem was seriously and substantially discussed.

Judging by Mr Shultz' remarks, Washington felt no optimism for the very reason that the negotiators expressed their satisfaction with the talks, which only confirms that governing quarters of the United States are opposed to the very idea of a political settlement. They prefer to continue the undeclared war against Afghanistan with the help of mercenaries. In fact State Secretary Shultz said as much while in Pakistan. He told newsmen it was too early to talk of the United States' acting as a guarantor of a possible political settlement. The United States is ready, however, to guarantee further interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan.

Mr Shultz made this clear when he visited one of the camps of so-called Afghan refugees and promised the leaders of the counterrevolutionary bands firm and constant American support. This was no empty promise, either, if we can judge by an earlier development. Last autumn, according to THE NEW YORK TIMES, President Reagan decided to increase the quantity and especially improve the quality of the weapons supplied. On his orders the Central Intelligence Agency is providing the counterrevolutionary bands with bazookas, mortars, grenade throwers, and recoilless rifles. A political settlement is not in the plans of Washington officials. They hate the popular government in Afghanistan and make no secret of wanting to overthrow it. Washington not only expresses skepticism about the Geneva talks but is doing all it can to keep them from producing results: for one, according to THE NEW YORK TIMES, when it granted Pakistan a loan of $3.2 billion it demanded that Islamabad sign no agreement of any kind with Kabul.

There is still another reason why Washington wants to keep up the tension in the area. It sees this tension as an excuse for expanding military contacts with Pakistan to the extent where it can even introduce troops: the State Department adviser, Frank Fukuyama, is said to have reported to his superiors that Pakistan could be used as a stopover when troops of the U.S. Rapid Deployment Force move from Diego Garcia island or the Phillippines to the Persian Gulf.

There is evidence that many politicians in Pakistan understand the implications of the pressure coming from Washington. While Mr Shultz was still in the country the newspaper STAR quoted the Baluchi leader (Jam Muhammad Marri) as saying that the United States is deliberately putting obstacles in the way of a just settlement of the Afghan problems. And he stressed that it was in the interests of Pakistan to begin direct talks with the Afghan Government without delay with a view to reaching a peace settlement.

PAKISTAN CONTINUES PROVOCATIONS AGAINST INDIA

PM102103 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Jul 83 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Provocative Actions"]

[Text] Delhi, 7 Jul -- Pakistan is continuing to mount provocative actions aimed at destabilizing the situation in the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir. As reported by the UNI news agency, Pakistani aircraft have twice violated Indian airspace in the abovementioned region in the last few days.

According to the evidence of the Indian press, Pakistani agents' subversive activity in the State of Jammu and Kashmir, with regard to which Islamabad has long put forward territorial claims, has been noticeably stepped up in recent times. At the beginning of the month security forces arrested two Pakistani spies not far from the city of Uri as they attempted to cross the de facto control line which separates from Indian that part of this Indian state's territory occupied by Pakistan. Records containing information of an espionage nature were confiscated from them.

FURTHER ON VISIT OF INDIA'S RAJIV GANDHI

Talks With Gromyko

LD081637 Moscow TASS in English 1437 GMT 8 Jul 83

["Friendly Conversation" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 8 TASS -- Andrey Gromyko, member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR and minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, has today received at the Kremlin Rajiv Gandhi, general secretary of the Indian National Congress (I) Party and a deputy to the Indian parliament, who is paying a visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of the USSR Parliamentary Group.

In the course of their conversation, which passed in an atmosphere of cordiality and mutual understanding, the sides touched upon various aspects of Soviet-Indian relations and certain international problems.

The sides believe that priority in the present-day complex international situation is attached to ending the arms race, averting nuclear catastrophe and strengthening the foundations of world peace. It is this, Andrey Gromyko said, that is the main message of the address of the participants in the recent meeting of the party and state leaders of socialist countries in Moscow to the NATO countries and all the countries of the world. The states of the socialist community put forward a broad range of constructive peace proposals and are prepared to join efforts with all those who would like to strengthen peace, as Yuriy Andropov has pointed out on more than one occasion.

The Soviet Union attaches much importance to cooperation with such a large country as India, which is doing a good deal to maintain peace in Asia and international security as a whole. We are thankful, Andrey Gromyko said, for its support for Soviet peace initiatives, including the proposal to freeze nuclear arsenals quantitatively and qualitatively.

It was stressed specifically by both sides that the experience accumulated in the development of Soviet-Indian relations on the basis of the 1971 treaty testifies to the need for the further extension of friendship and comprehensive cooperation between the two countries, thus meeting the vital interests of their peoples and promoting the cause of peace and stability in Asia and all over the world. The USSR would like to see the Republic of India a united, strong and thriving power, Andrey Gromyko said.

Rajiv Gandhi expressed gratitude for Andrey Gromyko's appreciation of Indian foreign policy. He also voiced profound satisfaction over the possibility accorded to him to learn at first hand about the life and work of the Soviet people.

Talks With Ponomarev

LD081653 Moscow TASS in English 1641 GMT 8 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 8 TASS -- Boris Ponomarev, alternate member of the Politbureau and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, has today met Rajiv Gandhi, general secretary of the Indian National Congress (I) party and a member of the Indian parliament.

During their conversation they touched upon certain outstanding issues of the international situation and of Soviet-Indian relations. Mutual interest was displayed in the further extension and development of friendship and comprehensive cooperation between the two countries, between the Soviet and Indian peoples.

The conversation passed in a cordial and friendly atmosphere.

Trade Talks With Patolichev

LD081656 Moscow TASS in English 1643 GMT 8 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 8 TASS -- Nikolay Patolichev, minister of foreign trade of the USSR, has today had a conversation with Rajiv Gandhi, general secretary of the Indian National Congress (I) Party and a member of the Indian Parliament. During the meeting, which passed in a cordial and friendly atmosphere, the sides discussed the state and prospects of the further extension of trade and economic contacts between the USSR and India.

INDIAN MINISTER MEETING WITH MEDIA OFFICIALS

BK091026 Delhi Domestic Service in English 0830 GMT 9 Jul 83

[Text] The information and broadcasting minister, Mr H.K.L. Bhagat, now in Moscow, has had a series of meetings with the Soviet media chiefs. Mr Bhagat discussed with the chairman of the Soviet State Committee on Cinematography, Mr Yermash, Indo-Soviet cooperation on films. They felt that the exchange of films has helped strengthening the bonds between the two peoples. Mr Bhagat also met the chairman of the State Committee for Television and Radio, Mr S.G. Lapin. They discussed the exchange of radio and TV programs between the two countries. The director general of the Soviet news agency TASS, Mr S.A. Losev, told Mr Bhagat that the nonaligned news pool is a right move toward the establishment of a new information order.

INDIA GETTING AID ON METALLURGICAL EQUIPMENT

BK091021 Delhi Domestic Service in English 0830 GMT 9 Jul 83

[Text] The Soviet Union has agreed to assist the Heavy Engineering Cooperation [HEC] at Ranchi to achieve a higher level of technological self-reliance in designing metallurgical equipment for steel plants. Under the agreement, the HEC will itself design the equipment it manufactures. Disclosing this to newsmen in Moscow, the secretary, department of heavy industry, Mr D.V. Kapur said the decision about the agreement has been taken at the first meeting of the Indo-Soviet working group on machine building.

Under a new arrangement, India and the Soviet Union have now decided to take a major step in production-sharing in the machine building sector and in conducting cooperative research. Under this, India will be able to manufacture equipment for Soviet industry when the capacity in the USSR is inadequate. Both the countries can also jointly work out the designing and manufacture of products for use in India and the Soviet Union or for sale to third countries.

CSSR DEFENSE MINISTER DZUR ON FRIENDLY VISIT

PM081505 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Jul 83 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Visit Continues"]

[Text] Army General M. Dzur, member of the CPCZ Central Committee and Czechoslovak national defense minister, who is on an official friendly visit to the Soviet Union, laid wreaths at the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum and at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier by the Kremlin wall. The Czecholslovak guests were accompanied by Army Ceneral A.T. Altunin, USSR deputy defense minister, Army Ceneral P.G. Lushev, and Lieutenant General G.A. Vorisov.

On the same day Army General M. Dzur visited the Yu. A. Gagarin Air Force Academy.

The Czechoslovak guests were familiarized with the training materials base and the organization of the training process. Army General M. Dzur was accompanied by Army General A. T. Altunin. Explanation was supplied by the academy chief, Marshal of Aviation N.M. Skomorokhov.

Comparison on Tikhonov Meeting

Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian on 8 July carries in its Second Edition on page 1 a report on the meeting between CSSR Minister of National Defense Martin Dzur and Nilolay Tikhonov ; chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers the KRASNAYA ZVEZDA report entitled "Conversation in the Kremlin," has been compared with the Moscow TASS version published in the 8 July Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page F 2, revealing the following variations:

Paragraph one, line two reads in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA: ... of the USSR, on 7 July received in the ...(substituting date for "today")

Paragraph one, Line four reads in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA: ... of the Communist Party of ... (deleting repeated phrase)

Last paragraph, last line reads in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA: ... countries in Moscow.

The following took part in the conversation: V.F. Maltsev, USSR first deputy foreign minister; Colonel General M. Blahnik, chief of the Czechoslovak People's Army General Staff and Czechoslovak first deputy national defense minister; Colonel General A. Brabec, chief of the Czechoslovak People's Army Main Political Directorate; and Z. Cheben, Czechoslovak charge d'affaires to the USSR. (supplying additional paragraph naming participants in meeting)

KADAR-LED DELEGATION TO VISIT MOSCOW MID-JULY

LD091630 Moscow TASS in English 1455 GMT 9 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 9 TASS -- A party and government delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic, led by first secretary of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party Janos Kadar, is to come to the Soviet Union for an official friendly visit in the second half of July at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

USSR CONGRATULATES NEW HUNGARIAN FOREIGN MINISTER

LD091846 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1750 GMT 9 Jul 83

[Text] The USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs has sent a greetings telegram to the minister of foreign affairs of the Hungarian People's Republic, Peter Varkonyi, in connection with his appointment as minister of foreign affairs of the Hungarian People's Republic.

The message wishes him success in activities aimed at carrying out the peace-loving foreign policies of Hungary for the well-being of the republic's people and in the interests of further developing fraternal friendship and all-round cooperation between our countries, strengthening the unity and cohesion of the socialist community, and consolidating peace and international security.

SOVIET AMBASSADORIAL APPOINTMENTS ANNOUNCED

Envoy to Poland

LD092040 Moscow TASS in English 2030 GMT 9 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 9 TASS -- Aleksandr Aksyonov has been appointed the Soviet Union's ambassador to the Polish People's Republic.

Boris Aristov has been relieved of his duties as the ambassador of the USSR to Poland in connection with transfer to another job.

Aleksandr Aksyonov was born in 1924. He has long held posts of responsibility in the young communist league, party and government. Between 1978 and 1983 he was chairman of the council of ministers of Belorrussia.

Ambassador to Bulgaria

LD092119 Moscow TASS in English 2027 GMT 9 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 9 TASS -- Leonid Grekov has been appointed ambassador of the USSR to the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

Nikita Tolubeyev has been relieved of his duties as the ambassador of the USSR to the People's Republic of Bulgaria in conjunction with his transfer to another job.

Leonid Grekov was born in 1928. He has long held posts of responsibility in the party. In 1976-1983 he worked as second secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan (a constituent republic in Soviet Central Asia).

MEDIA COVERAGE OF KOHL'S OFFICIAL VISIT

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA on Visit

PM082225 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 Jul 83 First Edition p 1

[Karen Karagezyan "International review": "No alternative"]

[Text] "We consider it important to seek ways of establishing agreement between countries belonging to different social systems. This is, if you like, an imperative of our nuclear age." These words, spoken by USSR Council of Ministers Chairman N.A. Tikhonov at the Kremlin dinner in honor of FRG Chancellor H. Kohl and Foreign Minister H.D. Genscher, were a concise expression of an extremely important trait of the present international situation.

As well as the ultrareactionary forces, which have been getting increasingly aggressive of late, there are other trends and other politicians in the capitalist world who show a willingness to take a realistic view of the situation in the international arena. They also recognize the need for, and the mutually advantageous nature of, peaceful coexistence among states with different social systems. As for the Soviet Union, ever since the first decree on peace the Leninist course toward peaceful coexistence has been an integral part of its foreign policy.

Suffice it to mention the emphasis placed on questions related to peaceful foreign policy at the June (1983) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and the eighth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. They discussed the problems comprehensively, taking into account the positive and negative trends of the present international situation. The plenum stressed, in particular, that peaceful coexistence is objectively aided by strategic military equilibrium between socialism and imperialism. The achievement of this equilibrium is one very important result of recent decades. It was a difficult task. Our people and the peoples of the other socialist community countries had to expend a lot of effort and resources to carry out this exceedingly important task. The plenum stated that the USSR will not let anyone break this balance, that Soviet people will do everything necessary to safeguard their country's security. "But if a reduction in the level of armaments and military expenditure were achieved on both sides, and disarmament were embarked on, which is what we are actively seeking, it would be a great boon for all countries and peoples," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov stressed in his plenum speech.

The Supreme Soviet session took a new concrete and impressive step in that direction: the supreme organ of state power instructed the Soviet Government to propose to the other nuclear powers a simultaneous quantitative and qualitative freeze on all existing nuclear armaments.

The Central Committee plenum noted that the socialist countries and their policy are currently a tremendously significant factor in the safeguarding of lasting world peace. The correctness of this conclusion was confirmed anew during the meeting of the leaders of seven European socialist countries, held in Moscow at the end of June. A broad program to eliminate the threat of war was put forward in a joint declaration.

At a time when the international situation is deteriorating through the fault of the imperialist forces, some Western propagandists and politicians have been quick to announce that "detente is dead." But is it not wishful thinking on the part of these gentlemen?

You do not have to go far for examples. We know how hard the U.S. representatives have tried to delay, indeed wreck the Madrid meeting of 35 European states, the United States and Canada. But in these last few days, good news has been arriving from Madrid. Apparently, the prospect of a favorable and imminent and to the meeting is becoming visible.

The Soviet-West German talks during the July visit to the USSR by FRG Chancellor H. Kohl and Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher were a notable example of continuing bilateral dialogue between the states of East and West. As is known, Chancellor H. Kohl is head of a major conservative party, the Christian Democratic Union [CDU]. You may recall, that in the early seventies this party, then in opposition, opposed the conclusion of the Moscow Treaty between the USSR and the FRG and the FRG's treaties with a number of other socialist countries and that if was one of the (few) parties in Europe which opposed the Helsinki conference and chose not to recognize the concept of "detente." It is worth recalling all this, if only to compare it with the words uttered by CDU Chairman and FRG Chancellor H. Kohl on 4 July in the Great Kremlin Palace. "...We want," he said, "to pursue a policy of mutual understanding, cooperation, detente and balancing of interests with the East on the basis of the treaties with the Soviet Union, Poland and the CSSR, giving them a tangible existence, on the basis of the Quadripartite Agreement, the treaty on the principles of relations with the GDR and the Helsinki Final Act and also on the basis of accords and statements based on these documents."

The comparison is cited by no means in order to expose the inconsitency of the CDU or its leaders -- after all, the path toward realistic assessments is a tortuous one. Nor should it be thought that the quotation absolutely fully and accurately reflects the actual nature of FRG foreign policy. Much of it does contradict the professed adherence to the detente policy (examples can be found in the same speech). Nevertheless, it is indisputable that change of approach (even if it remains in many respects declarative) by a major bourgeois party to important phenomena of modern life is indicative of the vitality and attractiveness of the ideas of detente and cooperation.

This was also apparent during the Soviet-West German talks, meetings, and conversations in recent days. The Soviet side stressed that by relying on the Moscow treaty, the USSR and the FRG have, by and large, managed in the past to find a common language and find solutions to any problems which have suited both side. It was noted that this experience is our joint asset and it is important not to waste it, given the present deterioration of the international situation.

During the examination of the prospects of mutual relations, many general assessments were made of important questions. Both sides stressed their commitment to expand constructive cooperation between the USSR and the FRG. It was agreed that the objective prerequisites exist for this. The sides stated that economic cooperation between the USSR and the FRG, while providing appreciable mutual benefit, exercises a positive influence on their relations in general. Everything required for their further deepening exists. It has been placed on a sound legal-treaty foundation and considerable business experience has been accumulated.

International as well as bilateral questions were discussed during the talks. Here too, naturally, great attention was paid to the problem of safeguarding European security. After all, it is becoming particularly acute in connection with the plans to deploy new U.S. medium-range weapons in West Germany [as published], above all on FRG territory.

There was a very frank discussion of this topic, in particular during H. Kohl's meeting with Yu.V. Andropov. What we have, Yu.V. Andropov stressed, is an attempt by the NATO bloc to radically alter the strategic situation in Europe to the detriment of the vital interests of the USSR and its allies. During the discussion, there was a refutation of the NATO countries' assertion that the USSR will make concessions at the Geneva talks on medium-range weapons following the introduction of the new U.S. missiles into Western Europe. If the deployment actually occurs, we will not surrender our positions, we will not relax our defenses; we will adopt prompt and effective retaliatory measures to protect the security of the USSR and its allies. At the same time, it was noted that until deployment starts an honest agreement, taking into account both sides' interests, is still possible.

On the eve of the trip to the USSR, both Chancellor H. Kohl and Minister H.-D. Genscher talked about the policy of the present FRG Government and emphasized the quality of "predictability" -- a valuable characteristic which is, as it were, the opposite to irresponsibility, to political adventurism. The only trouble is that, in the event of the deployment of foreign nuclear missiles on West German soil, the fate of the actual Federal Republic as well as its policy may turn out to be unpredictable.

Genuinely predictable -- we prefer to say consistent -- is the policy of the USSR and its allies. Our banners bear Lenin's slogan to the effect that disarmament is the ideal of socialism. Our course toward cooperation and detente really does accord with the peoples' interests.

'Maintaining Permanent Dialogue'

LD102111 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 10 Jul 83

[From the "International Panorama" Program presented by Nikolay Shishlin]

[Text] The visit of the FRG federal chancellor to the Soviet Union, which took place last week, undoubtedly enters into the framework of the broad efforts being undertaken by our country and our allies in smoothing out international relations. As you know the party Central Committee Politburo has evaluated the results of the talks with the West German leaders. This evaluation pays particular attention to the principled position held by the Soviet leaders at the talks on the fundamental question of security in Europe and, of course, to the position which was stated to the West German leaders, Kohl and Genscher, regarding the prospects for the development of Soviet-West German cooperation in various spheres.

We positively evaluated Kohl's statement on the adherence of the present Bonn government to the Moscow treaty and its aspiration to give this treaty abundant concrete substance. And, of course, the present significant volume of Soviet-West German economic links is not the ceiling, just as those links which exist between us and West Germany in culture, sport, tourism and so forth are not the limit of the possibilities.

Undoubtedly, it is fundamentally important that both the Soviet Union and the FRG confirmed the significance that they attach to relations with each other. This is a plus. This is a good result.

Maybe it could be said that the talks also confirmed the general anxiety with the present position in the world, first and foremost in Europe. But the agreement did not go further than this. The key point is the problem of nuclear weapons in Europe. You know very well that West Germany is due to accept the whole enormous arsenal of Pershing-II and a sizable portion of American cruise missiles at the end of this year, if NATO's intentions are implemented. And West Germany is by no means a passive element in this situation.

The West German leaders defend with might and main the NATO decision, the so-called two-track decision, and they spoke openly of this in Moscow. Although in Moscow too, the West German side maybe spoke a little more positively about the fact that they are interested in the success of the Geneva talks, and that the Americans are allegedly ready to do their bit for a mutually acceptable agreement.

Our position was outlined with the utmost clarity by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov. We see the NATO intention as an attempt to overturn the strategic balance in Europe to the detriment of the security of our country and that of our allies. And a whole series of truths were exposed during these talks. Two seem to be particularly important. The first is that an agreement is possible if the NATO decision regarding the deployment of missiles is not implemented. It is possible up to deployment. And one is led to think that this idea, which was adhered to in the course of the talks, was noticed in the West. And the second circumstance -- I believe that there can be no illusions left today regarding the reaction of the Soviet Union and its allies in the Warsaw Pact as to what will happen if the American gifts appear on the territory of West Europe. The Soviet Union will take the appropriate timely and effective measures in response and the strategic balance in Europe will not be upset. So that here there is food for thought, basis for conclusions and basis for practical actions by those with whom the talks in Moscow were conducted and those too who more than just attentively, kept an eye on these talks.

And of course one would like to hope that Bonn will hold a realistic position in the light of the Moscow talks. But the fact that as a result of the visit an understanding was reached on maintaining a permanent dialogue between the two countries is of no small importance. Outside of dialogue there can be no agreement. And dialogue means that there is still a possibility of coming to some common viewpoint. It means that there is a possibility of outlining some sort of understanding and strengthening trust. Today, the results of the talks are being animatedly discussed in the world, and of course they are being discussed in the FRG.

Aims 'Mutually Exclusive'

LD092213 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 9 Jul 83

[From the Vremya newscast; video talk by political observer Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Text] Meetings between the leaders of the USSR and the FRG have always been important events in the development of Soviet-West German relations, and the latest such meeting was certainly no exception. It became further proof of the vital force of European detente, a proof that stable relations, cooperation and partnership between two of the major countries of the European Continent are not a temporary phenomenon but an objective requirement dictated by the national interest of the two countries.

One of the results of the Moscow talks, it seems to me, was the fact that, as may be assumed, they helped the FRG statesmen to comprehend better all the most serious responsibility which they would bear in the event of the deployment of the new American nuclear weapons on West German soil. To judge by Chancellor Kohl's public utterances, his visit had a triple aim: to act as a spokesman for the notorious 'arming-up' of NATO on the one hand, as a defender of German interests, as he says, on another; and finally, to facilitate constructive and good-neighborly relations with the Soviet Union.

But these aims are mutually exclusive. The Soviet leaders with full justification stressed that the implementation of the NATO missile plans would seriously complicate the international situation, would increase the danger of war for the FRG and would have a negative effect on Soviet-West German relations.

By turning West Germany into a launching pad for its nuclear missiles aimed at the Soviet Union and its allies, Washington, along with everything else, wants to set the Federal Republic at odds with its Eastern neighbors and to deepen the split in Europe, since one cannot imagine trust and good-neighborliness existing in the shadow of missiles and through a dense hedge of them.

The Soviet Union, Comrade Andropov stressed, finds it hard to understand what the FRG hopes to gain from the deployment of the American missiles on its soil, and from our countermeasures, and thus the saturation of central Europe with all forms of weapons of mass destruction. We favor another way. We want to have European security with the least possible quantity of nuclear weapons, or better still with none at all. We should like the Soviet Union and the FRG to be not enemies but partners, not only in economics and culture, but also in questions of security. The security of this desire is apparent in the many specific proposals made by our country, and it is important, extremely important, that having returned home, the FRG leaders should seriously assess them and adopt a realistic position in accordance with the interests of peace.

BUSH'S EUROPEAN TOUR 'DOOMED BEFORE STARTED'

LD090153 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 8 Jul 83

[Text] In our commentary at this time, Vladislav Kozyakov looks at the outcome of the European tour by American Vice-President George Bush:

George Bush was faced with a formidable task. It was his job to prove that black is white. He was supposed to impress on his European interlocutors, that Reagan's policy of stockpiling nuclear weapons is needed in order to reduce such weapons. It was his job to try and convince (?the) Europeans that the siting of new American nuclear missiles in Western Europe would help progress at Geneva. And, indeed, that is what he was doing throughout the 2 weeks of his tour of the European capitals. However, no amount of rhetoric and so-called public diplomacy can allay public fears over Reagan's policies, since the great peril inherent in the President's intentions is for all to see. Their purpose is to enhance nuclear confrontation, primarily in Europe. They defy human reason -- they defy common sense.

Speaking in Copenhagen, George Bush felt impelled to acknowledge the feelings prevalent among Europeans that President Reagan has not displayed a sincere desire to seek a reduction in nuclear armaments -- That the United States does not want arms control. Rather, it wants an unrestrained arms race, and that the Pentagon is planning a limited nuclear war in Europe. But then there was little Bush could do to dispell this image of American policy. He attempted to dismiss it as a delusion, and in so doing he ignores the public awareness of the facts the Pentagon's secret documents, now made public, about preparations for a nuclear war, the program of America's nuclear rearmament, the President's own statements about the possibility of using nuclear weapons, and about a bid for military supremacy.

While in Western Europe, the vice president put forward no new suggestions or arguments indicating the administration's willingness to take account of reality and work towards a lower level of confrontation in Europe. On the contrary, the purpose of his visit was to distract public attention from preparations in Western Europe for the deployment of American nuclear missiles by empty rhetoric about American flexibility at the Geneva talks and by repeated attacks on the Soviet Union. That these preparations were intensified during the weeks of the European tour by the American vice president is hardly a coincidence. The French news agency quoted a NATO spokesman as saying the deployment of American missiles in Federal Germany, Britain, and Italy was in fact already under way in so far as preparatory work was going on at the bases. The missiles were being moved into place and the personnel to man then was being trained.

The vice president's European tour has served as a reminder to Europeans of the menacing nature of Reagan's policy of undermining the relaxation process, whipping up the arms race, and exacerbating the international situation -- a result Washington did not want to contemplate in the first place. THE WASHINGTON POST has pointed out that some European governments will never identify themselves with Washington's policy. They are interested in a measure of detente more than the Reagan administration. It says the Europeans are trying to maintain normal relations with the Soviet Union and are making genuine attempts to improve the climate in the East-West relations. In short, the vice president's trip was doomed before it started, insofar as its purpose was to impose Reagan's adventuristic policies on the Europeans. Trying to oppose nations' aspirations for a durable peace and their wish to see the nuclear menace averted is an unnatural undertaking. Small wonder then that wherever he went, the American vice president was met by demonstrators protesting against American policy.

LAMBSDORFF ON FUTURE FOR FRG-USSR ECONOMIC TIES

PM050911 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Jul 83 Morning Edition p 4

[Interview with FRG Minister of Economics O. Lambsdorff by APN correspondent V. Markov: "'Developing Mutually Advantageous Cooperation'" -- date not given]

[Text] The FRG Federal Government and business circles are interested in further expanding and deepening Soviet-West German cooperation in the economic, scientific, and technical field. Its successful development can exert beneficial influence on the stabilization of the political situation in Europe. That opinion was voiced by FRG Federal Minister of Economics O. Lambsdorff, who has been visiting Moscow. In an interview which the minister gave to APN correspondent V. Markov specially for IZVESTIYA, O. Lambsdorff said:

During my visit to the Soviet capital, there was a discussion of a wide range of questions concerning trade and economic cooperation between the FRG and the Soviet Union. As a whole, we are satisfied with the state of this cooperation. In the past 10 years, business ties between the two countries have been developing consistently and dynamically. However, that does not mean that we can rest on our laurels. Both sides are convinced that quite good opportunities exist for considerably expanding bilateral commodity exchange.

Given the present employment situation in the FRG, we are naturally seeking to obtain new foreign economic orders. Trade and economic cooperation with the USSR helps to safeguard and create new jobs in our country.

At the next session of the USSR-FRG Commission on Economic and Scientific-Technical Cooperation, scheduled for November, priority will be given to discussion of joint projects in the field of agriculture and food production. We know that in your country, major capital investments are being earmarked with a view to reconstructing and modernizing various sectors, particularly the light, machine building, and metallurgical industries. Here, too, broad opportunities exist for firms from the FRG to take part in appropriate projects. Of course, new joint projects in the field of energy are also under discussion, including projects for extracting, processing, and transporting coal.

The two sides also place great importance on increasing deliveries of industrial output from the Soviet Union to the FRG. This important question will also be examined during the forthcoming session of the joint intergovernmental commission.

Good political mutual relations are the first priority for East and West. Good economic ties cannot replace such relations. However, there is no doubt either, that close trade and economic cooperation can greatly help to improve interstate relations as a whole.

A broad range of questions of mutual relations between the USSR and the FRG will be discussed by the Soviet leaders and Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl during his forthcoming visit to Moscow. Their mutual acquaintance and the maintenance of dialogue are of very great importance in our view. There will also be an examination of questions of the further development of trade and economic cooperation. I hope that the results of my talks in the Soviet capital will also help that.

FRG'S GENSCHER ARRIVES IN U.S. FOR TALKS

LD111101 Moscow TASS in English 1050 GMT 11 Jul 83

[Text] Washington July 11 TASS -- Hans-Dietrich Genscher, foreign minister of the FRG, has arrived here for an official visit. He is to hold talks with President Ronald Reagan, Secretary of State George Shultz and other high-ranking members of the administration.

According to a UPI report, during his stay in the USA, H.-D. Genscher is to discuss in detail the results of the recent visit by Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl to the USSR and his talks with the Soviet Leaders on the problem of arms control. As is known, the United States is planning, under NATO's so-called "double decision" of December 1979, to deploy already this year the first batches of new American medium-range nuclear missiles in West German territory.

In UPI's opinion, much attention at the forthcoming talks will be given to East-West relations and the Soviet-American talks in Geneva.

SPD ARTICLE CRITICAL OF FRG FOREIGN POLICY CITED

PM070941 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jul 83 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Result of the First 100 Days"; subheaded "SPD Press Bulletin on FRG Foreign Polity"]

[Text] Bonn, 6 Jul -- The Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD) press bulletin PARLIAMENTARISCH-POLITISCHER PRESSEDIENST has published an article analyzing the foreign policy course of the ruling Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union (CDU/CSU) and Free Democratic Party (FDP) coalition which says, inter alia: the results of the first 100 days allow the conclusion to be drawn that the disputes being pursued by the government over current policy can only be seen as concealing a change in foreign policy course overshadowing all else, and marking a renunciation of the continuity which is talked about so much.

The conservatives are trying to fit East-West relations into their own typical outline, refusing to approach the examination of global problems in an unprejudiced and critical way. They are propagandizing force, above all military force, in a pretty political wrapping. The rightists have started once again advocating a hostile attitude to the Soviet Union, and the task of foreign policy is seen by them as struggling against "expansionist Soviet imperialism striving for world revolution."

"The policy of detente" and "partnership in the security sphere" have been so defamed that they are virtually dirty words in the conservatives' lexicon. No CDU/CSU politician ever manages to make a speech on foreign policy questions without describing the Soviet Union as a "threat" and the "source of all international problems."

A second sphere includes the resurrection by the conservatives of the German question, with the gamble being made not on continuing reconciliation with the East European countries but on the question of the borders of the German reich -- a question which is becoming the starting point in this policy.

A third complex of problems ensues from the attitude to the NATO "two-track" decision and "arms upgrading." A desire for a policy of force is quite clearly in action here. The fact that the federal government is acting in complete accord with the Reagan administration in this does not make the policy any more right. A political conflict is essentially what is involved. Even CDU/CSU politicians admit that the medium-range missiles are a political weapon. Their deployment is being used to back up the gamble on military force, while any attempt to find a real political solution is completely rejected.

DANISH CP DELEGATION PAYS VISIT TO USSR

PM071037 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jul 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Danish Communists in Soviet Union"]

[Text] A delegation of Danish Communist Party [DKP] party workers and activists headed by P. Emanuel, member of the Executive Committee and secretary of the DKP Central Committee, was in the Soviet Union from 23 June through 5 July at the CPSU Central Committee's invitation.

The Danish comrades familiarized themselves with the experience of the CPSU's work in implementing the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee 1982-1983 plenums and had meetings at the CPSU Central Committee Party Organizational Work and International Sections. The delegation traveled to the Uzbek SSR, where it was received at the Uzbek CP Central Committee and visited industrial and agricultural enterprises and scientific and cultural institutions.

In the talks which took place the delegation members rated highly the Soviet people's achievements in the economic, social, and cultural fields and the Soviet Union's role in the struggle to strengthen peace and prevent thermonuclear war. Special emphasis was placed on the importance of the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum and the eighth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the policy provisions and conclusions contained in Comrade Yu.V. Andropov's speech at the plenum for the further improvement of developed socialism and the safeguarding of peace throughout the world.

COMMENTARIES ON SHULTZ' MISSION TO MIDDLE EAST

Trip Ends in 'Failure'

LD081339 Moscow TASS in English 1251 GMT 8 Jul 83

[Text] Damascus July 9 TASS -- U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz has completed his Middle Eastern tour, which took him to Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, Syria, Israel, Jordan and Egypt. The main aim of the mission of the high-placed American representative was the attempt to push through the notorious "Reagan plan" on the Middle East and attain realization of the inequitable agreement with Israel which was imposed upon Lebanon.

Even the Western press was compelled to admit that Shultz's trip was a failure. Thus, the British DAILY TELEGRAPH emphasizes that the tour was a downright failure. It not only led to a heightening of tension in the region but was a pointer to failures of the American policy. In the course of the trip it become obvious that all rumors on "some pressure" which Washington allegedly intends to exert upon Israel to make it more "tractable" are absolutely ungrounded and are nothing but misinformation. Moreover, the United States actually encouraged its partner in the military-political strategic alliance -- Israel -- for continuation of Lebanon's occupation, which opens the way to further build-up of the American military presence in the Middle East.

The newspaper WASHINGTON POST openly admits that in a letter which was signed by Shultz and Israeli Foreign Minister Shamir, the United States undertook to support Israel in case of Syria's refusal to withdraw its troops from Lebanon.

The development of the situation in the Middle East shows that the United States seeks to actively use the results of the Israeli aggression against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples, it is gaining a still firmer foot on Lebanese soil, is trying to turn that sovereign Arab country into a military springboard for sallies against neighboring states. Meanwhile the visit of the American emissary demonstrated that the progressive forces of the Arab world firmly turn down Washington's imperial plans, that they consistently come out for genuinely fair and firm Middle East settlement on the basis of the unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli troops from all occupied Arab lands and satisfaction of the legitimate national rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

Shabayev on 'Failure'

LD082111 Moscow TASS in English 2100 GMT 8 Jul 83

["Logical Failure" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 8 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Boris Shabayev writes:

The Western press characterises the latest mission of George Shultz in the Middle East as a "failure," a "defeat," and "impotence of American diplomacy." The U.S. secretary of state himself does not deny that his three-day tour of the countries of that region was unsuccessful. Frankly, it is a logical result, predetermined, actually by the very contents of U.S. policy in the Middle East. The essence of this anti-Arab policy is American-Israeli strategic cooperation, aimed at eliminating the gains of the national liberation movement of the Arab peoples and at establishing a joint military-political protectorate in that region.

Using Tel Aviv as a crack force and supplying it with everything necessary to enable it step by step to carry out aggression against the Arab countries, Washington then pops up on the Mideastern diplomatic scene with all sorts of "initiatives."

The goal of all these "initiatives" is to perpetuate the results of Israel's piratic actions and to turn them to U.S. benefit in order to expand direct American military presence in the region and to get new means of putting pressure on the Arabs. And on every occasion the United States tries to create the impression that it does not have anything at all to do with the Israeli aggression. That was the case when the Camp David deal was drawn up and formalized and that was how an onerous "agreement" with Israel was cooked up and imposed on Beirut literally at gunpoint. The implementation of the latter would mean the actual division of the sovereign Lebanese state, which would become a staging area for further acts of aggression, first and foremost against Syria. That was how that document was viewed by the national patriotic forces of Lebanon itself, by Syria and by the Arab public at large.

On the strength of this evaluation Syria, for which protection of its national interests and security is inseparable from the common Arab cause, first and foremost the just cause of the fraternal Palestinian people, reaffirmed to the Washington emissary that it decisively rejected that shameful agreement. No threats, even the threat of another aggression, and no pressure can shake this principled stand, the Syrian newspaper AL-BAATH writes in this connection.

What conclusions then are prompted by the obvious failure of American policy (and this is how the London DAILY TELEGRAPH characterises Shultz's mission)? The first and most important one is that the intricate tangle of Mideastern problems cannot and will not be untied by force, blackmail or escalation of aggression, or by separate details into which Washington and Tel Aviv are trying to drag some Arab countries to the prejudice of others.

The second conclusion is that any deals ignoring the legitimate rights and interests of the Arab people of Palestine are bound to fail because they have been coming and will continue to come against the Arabs' growing resistance. Lastly, one cannot agree more with the French newspaper LIBERACION which believes that the failure of Shultz's mission was inevitable because of the fallacy of Reagan's foreign policy, aimed at keeping the USSR from participation in the solution of Mideastern problems. Hoping that in this way it will isolate the Arabs and impair their resistance to the American-Israeli hegemonistic plans, Washington comes into obvious conflict with political realities in the Middle East, which are ever clearer in the minds of many realistic Americans. Notable Middle East experts Richard Arens and Alfred Gerteiny, criticising Reagan's patently anti-Arab course in the influential newspaper CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, stated directly that no lasting and just settlement in that region was possible without the Soviet Union's participation.

However, Washington remains a captive to its own foreign policy dogmas and, apparently, is not going to reckon with obvious truths.

U.S., Israeli Goals

LD091524 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1145 GMT 9 Jul 83

[From the International Review program presented by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov]

[Text] This week Shultz, U.S. secretary of state, undertook another Middle East trip. I happened to witness his May tour of this region, when by order of Washington the Lebanese-Israeli agreement was signed. Shultz' route this time included Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, Syria, Israel, Jordan and Egypt.

You will remember the noise Washington made publicizing the agreement that was forced on Lebanon and rejected by the patriotic forces of the Lebanese people, Syria and a number of other Arab countries for being one-sided and for presenting special privileges to the Israeli occupationists and the U.S. military contingent in Lebanon. Nearly 2 months have passed since the signing of this agreement, but the Israelis are not even thinking of leaving Lebanon. Tel Aviv has made withdrawal of its forces from Lebanese territory conditional on the preliminary withdrawal from Lebanon of Syrian units and Palestinian detachments. What is more, Israel is intensifying military tension in the Al-Biqa' Valley, provoking clashes with Syrian forces.

The Israelis are not halting military operations on occupied Lebanese territory. In Tel Aviv there is now discussion of redeploying the occupying forces. Israel, Foreign Affairs Minister Shamir announced, will deploy its forces at new strategic frontiers in Lebanon in order to keep them there as long as conditions of security require. Israel's intention of consolidating itself in southern Lebanon is causing increasing alarm to the Beirut government, too, which has received a hail of criticism from wide circles of Lebanese society for its concessions to Washington and Tel Aviv.

The Lebanese-Israeli agreement, and along with it U.S. policy in this matter, have reached an impasse. This suits Tel Aviv completely, but not Washington, which understands that if the agreement is broken this might seriously undermine the U.S. political course in the region, which is aimed as we know at supporting the Israeli aggressors and isolating the Arab world.

Then 2 months later Shultz has again undertaken another trip to the Near East to remove obstacles to the Lebanese-Israeli agreement. The main aim of Shultz' visit was to remove Syrian opposition to the Israeli occupiers. However, as the visit of the secretary of state to Damascus showed, he did not succeed in achieving this. Shultz himself said that his stay in the Syrian capital did not result in any perceptible progress. Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad noted after his talks with Shultz that the Syrian position on the Lebanese-Israeli agreement is final and fixed. This agreement, Al-Asad stressed, is dangerous for the security and interests of Lebanon, Syria and the Arab peoples, and for the cuase of peace in the region.

During talks in Saudi Arabia, according to U.S. press reports, King Fahd took a negative line toward the Lebanese-Israeli agreement in his talks with Shultz. The Saudi monarch, U.S. papers wrote, views this agreement as a reward for Israel's incursion into Lebanon and occupation of the country. During his stay in Beirut Shultz learned that the Lebanese Government is expressing serious concern at the possibility of a redeployment of Israeli forces to positions more convenient for them in southern Lebanon.

Thus, the latest trip to the Near East by the head of the State Department has exposed even further the aims of the Israeli occupationists and their U.S. patrons, and has failed to bring the desired success to the Reagan administration, which is striving under cover of Israeli aggression to expand its own military-political position in this region.

Reagan's Anti-Arab Stand

LD091342 Moscow TASS in English 1256 GMT 9 Jul 83

[Text] Washington July 9 TASS -- President Reagan had at the White House a meeting with the Secretary of State George Shultz who informed him of the results of his Middle Eastern tour which took him to Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, Syria, Israel, Jordan and Egypt. His main aim was to try hard to push through the notorious "Reagan Plan" on the Middle East and to attain implementation of the inequitable agreement with Israel, which was imposed upon Lebanon. But, as is noted by the American press, George Shultz's tour was a failure.

The newspaper WASHINGTON POST stresses that the unsuccessful mission of the U.S. secretary of state to the Middle East landed the American initiatives in that region into a blind alley which might be detrimental to the Reagan administration both in the United States itself and abroad. The White House did not justify the public expectations during the hurriedly organised Middle Eastern tour of the secretary of state, the newspaper stresses.

In the course of the tour it became obvious that all rumors on Washington's some intention [as received] to exert "pressure" upon Israel to make it more "tractable" in the question of withdrawal of troops from Lebanon, are absolutely groundless and are pure misinformation. Moreover, the United States actually encouraged the Israeli aggressors for continuation of the occupation of the sovereign Lebanese state, viewing it as a way to further buildup of the American military presence in the Middle East.

According to the newspaper WASHINGTON POST, in the letter which was signed by George Shultz and Israeli Foreign Minister Shamir, the United States undertook to support Israel in case of Syria's refusal to withdraw its troops from Lebanon. Upon completion of the abortive mission of the U.S. secretary of state, the head of the administration reaffirmed the invariability of Washington's anti-Arab stand. Reagan said that the administration will not retreat in its efforts to exert pressure on Syria, writes the newspaper NEW YORK TIMES.

Meanwhile, the visit of the high-placed American emissary demonstrated that the progressive forces of the Arab world firmly turn down Washington's Middle East policy, that they consistently advocate genuinely fair and durable settlement of the Middle East problem on the basis of the unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli troops from all occupied Arab lands and satisfaction of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

[Moscow TASS in English at 1500 GMT on 9 July transmits a service message which replaces the last two paragraphs of the 1256 GMT transmission with the following:

[...the Middle East.

[Washington's anti-Arab stand was also reaffirmed by the head of the U.S. Administration. Ronald Reagan declared, THE NEW YORK TIMES said, that his administration would not backpedal in its pressure on Syria.

At the same time the visit of the highly-placed U.S. emissary has demonstrated that the intricate knot of problems in the Middle East can and will be disentangled neither by methods of power politics, blackmail and escalation of aggression nor by way of separate deals in which Washington and Tel Aviv are trying to engage some Arab countries to the detriment of others. The progressive forces of the Arab world are firmly opposed to U.S. policy in the Middle East and are consistently pressing for a truly just and enduring settlement of the Middle East problem on the basis of an unqualified withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied Arab territories and the implementation of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine. The Arabs have resisted and will resist even more vigorously any deals that ignore these rights. The failure of the U.S. state secretary's mission was inevitable in view of the hopeless [word indistinct] of the Reagan administration's policy which is aiming to remove the USSR from participation in resolving the problems of the Middle East. Washington's hope that acting in this way will enable it to isolate the Arabs and weaken their resistance to U.S.-Israeli hegemonic plans is clearly at odds with political reality in the Middle East.]

PLO OFFICIALS ON NEED FOR PALESTINIAN UNITY

Abu Mahir Interview

LD082351 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1530 GMT 18 Jul 83

[From the "Arab Palestinian People's Corner" program]

[Text] Abu Mahir, member of the PLO Executive Committee and a prominent Palestinian leader, has participated in our program. In this interview with our correspondent Comrade Abu Mahir dealt with issues facing the Palestinian resistance movement. He said:

[Begin recording] It is important to me to express my thanks and appreciation to the Soviet broadcasting stations, writers, and journalists, who gave us this opportunity, to visit the Soviet Union and to speak to Soviet citizens about the Palestinian situation, which is in a critical stage, particularly in light of the resolutions adopted by our recent National Council session in Algeria, as reported by the political information at the conclusion of the council's 16th session.

In our view, these resolutions have contributed toward maintaining Palestinian national unity and at the same time toward keeping the Palestinian issue away from the imperialist conspiracies and the scheme of a [words indistinct]. They also deal with a number of topics related to Palestinian action inside and outside the occupied territories. These resolutions also deal with our relations with Arab regimes and our relations at the international level. These resolutions on the Palestinian situation and the Palestinian issue began with the importance of Palestinian national unity. This unity enables us to confront the imperialist conspiracies, and more importantly prevents the dismembering of the Palestinian ranks.

The Zionist aggression against Lebanon is aimed at striking the Palestinian resistance and eventually (?crushing it). The basic issue is Palestinian national unity. We are determined to achieve more cohesion and to unite in the struggle under the leadership of the PLO so that we can reach the objectives for which our people have struggled for so long.

We have a basic and important subject -- namely, our people in the occupied territories and the Zionist conspiracies they face, such as building Zionist settlements and bringing Zionists from all parts of the world to settle in our homelnad. This calls for support for our people's struggle in the occupied territories with all the power and capabilities we possess. The PLo must buttress our people's struggle, provide them with steadfastness capabilities and help them build the national front which mobilizes all potential under one leadership to confront the scheme that seeks to own the land, usurp it from its owners, and render them homeless.

The basic issue facing the PLO is how to ensure support, in all possible areas, to our people to stand steadfast and hold on to the land. Our people inside the occupied territory have proved they are able to confront the Zionist scheme. Any type of terrorism or oppression is futile. The latest example of this was the poisoning of our citizens in the occupied territory which was meant to force them to leave their land and seek another life elsewhere.

Thus, the essential task is to ensure our people sufficient support (?for) steadfastness so they can continue to resist the Zionist conspiracy. [end recording]

DFLP Delegates' Press Conference

LD082346 Moscow in Arabic to Arab World 1530 GMT 8 Jul 83

[Text] A news conference was held in Moscow for the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine (DFLP) delegation led by Nayif Hawatimah, the general secretary of the front. A great number of Soviet journalists were gathered in the Conferences Hall at the Soviet Committee for Afro-Asian Solidarity: correspondents from PRAVDA, TASS, radio and TV, and NOVOSTI, the press agency -- in short, all main institutions of the Soviet mass media. The interest in the news conference is understandable. Despite Tel Aviv's and Washington's attempts to suppress the Palestinian resistance movement, this movement is widening day after day, consolidating its positions and gaining new friends and allies throughout the world. The DFLP is considered one of the outstanding detachments in the Palestinian resistance movement. Today the front's delegation led by its general secretary Nayif Hawatimah, met the Soviet journalists. Here is the head of the Palestinian delegation opening the news conference:

[Begin recording] Dear comrades and friends, it is our delegation's pleasure to meet the representatives of the Soviet media and the comrade representatives of the Soviet popular organizations and institutions to express to you and through you to the Soviet masses our people's appreciation for the Soviet Union's stand on the rights of the Palestinian people and the peoples of the Arab nation. The Soviet Union, which proceeds from a firm Leninist basis in its foreign policy, constitutes the biggest assistance to the struggle of the Palestinian people to recover their right to return to their country, to their self-determination, to their independent Palestinian state under the leadership of the PLO, the sole and legitimate representative of our people. The Soviet Union offers all kinds of support to the Arab peoples in their struggle against American imperialism, against the Camp David accords, against Reagan's plan and against the recent American-Israeli-Lebanese agreement. [end recording]

Then the conference warmed up, the correspondents put forward their numerous questions about the measures to strengthen the unity of the ranks of the Palestinian revolution, and about the situation in Lebanon and the tasks of the Palestinian resistance movement at present. Every question was answered in detail. One of them dealt with the forthcoming maneuvers of the U.S. Rapid Deployment Force which will shortly be staged in the region. This question was answered by Yasir 'Abd Rabbuh, one of the PLO military and political leaders, deputy secretary general of the DFLP and member of the PLO Executive Committee:

[Begin recording] The American Administration, under its plan to tighten military control over the Middle East, continues the operation to expand the establishment of military bases and increase the Rapid Deployment Force in this region. It also works in collaboration with some of its agent regimes in this region to stage the so-called military maneuvers in order to complete this plan. It is well known that the Pentagon's aggressive design for the Middle East depends basically on Israel's role as a major base for expansion, aggression, and control. Therefore the United States' aggressive military operations in the Middle East rely in the first place on the American-Israeli strategic agreement which was announced a few years ago and the most significant fruits of which was the aggression launched by Israel on Lebanon last year. In this instance, the maneuvers, the extension of the Rapid Deployment Force and the establishment of bases, all of these become part of a comprehensive and basic plan to control the entire region. This plan can only be confronted in a comprehensive manner by the national liberation of the Arab region and the Middle East, through the unity of these forces and the pursuance of a firm policy against imperialist interference and aggression. [end recording]

The conference held by the DFLP delegation lasted about 2 hours. Therefore we cannot speak of all that was said. We will present some of the DFLP leaders' replies to the journalists' questions in our next programs.

QADDUMI DUE IN MOSCOW TO PREPARE 'ARAFAT VISIT

LD091441 Riyadh SPA in Arabic 1340 GMT 9 Jul 83

[Text] Tunis, 9 Jul (SPA) -- A high-level Palestinian delegation will begin a visit to Moscow on Monday in response to an official Soviet invitation. The delegation will be led by PLO Political Department head Faruq Qaddumi. Among the members of the delegation will be members of the PLO Executive Committee Mahmud Abbas and Yasir 'Abd Rabbuh.

Fatah Central Committee member Salah Khalaf said today, during a stop at Rome airport en route to East Berlin, that PLO executive Committee Chairman Yasir 'Arafat will leave for Moscow within a week in response to a Soviet invitation for consultation with the Soviet leaders about the current position in the al-Biqa' Valley. He added that Mr Qaddumi and his delegation will prepare for Mr 'Arafat's visit to Moscow and his talks with the Soviet leaders. WAFA reported from Tunis that the Palestinian-Soviet talks will basically concentrate on the serious development in the Palestinian arena. It added that Mr 'Arafat has received an invitation to visit the Soviet Union himself and for a visit by the PLO Executive Committee delegation, too.

U.S., FRENCH ROLES IN CHAD CONFLICT CRITICIZED

Air Bridge in Ndjamena

LD082214 Moscow in English to Africa 1700 GMT 8 Jul 83

[Excerpts] The events in Chad have been growing more tense. The events in Chad have drawn in quite a few external forces. The western press says Egypt, Sudan and Morocco have volunteered to help Habre, following Zaire. France has established an air bridge with Ndjamena and is pouring weapons and ammunition. (?Mind), Paris seems to be ready to give not only hardware; it claims the presence of military advisers will be needed and it may send them in the near future. Besides, Hissene Habre has sent a personal message to the French President, Francois Mitterrand, asking him for an invasion in Chad. The paper LE MONDE says France has begun restoring its base in Chad.

The United States, too, has a finger in the pie. Goukouni Oueddei noted time and again that the Central Intelligence Agency directly assisted in the overthrow of this regime. Washington today claims a leading role in a solution of Chad's internal problems. To conceal their aims in Chad the West and its supporters in Africa have accused Libya of involvement in the conflict. The accusations, however, were flatly rejected by the Libyan leader, Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi. Even the French foreign minister, Claude Cheysson, had to admit the lack of facts of Libyan interference. Nonetheless, the campaign against Libya is rampant. The United States is playing first fiddle. The American Eisenhower aircraft carrier has approached Libyan shores. Its planes keep violating Libya's airspace. Although a State Department spokesman described this as ordinary maneuvers the CBS television network speaks of a showdown of strength and a resumed war of nerves with Tripoli. All this is proof that imperialist powers are capitalizing on the crisis in Chad.

The chairman of the Organization of African Unity, Mengistu Haile Mariam, has urged the countries of Africa and other continents to steer clear of interference in the Chad conflict, saying that the conflict must be solved in the OAU framework. Such interference only fuels the conflict and threatens to turn Chad into a flashpoint of tension in the whole region.

Military Operations Intensifying

LD091531 Moscow Domestic Television service in Russian 1145 GMT 9 Jul 83

[From the "International Review" program presented by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov]

[Excerpts] In the savannahs and deserts of the central African republic of Chad, fierce fighting has been going on for many days.

After the troops of Goukouni Ouedde had won a number of impressive victories over Habre's forces, and liberated an important strategic point in the north, Faya Largeau, France and the United States began openly helping the Habre regime. Military cargoes and various equipment were airlifted to Ndjamena from france. Habre asked president Mitterand to send a French expeditionary force into Chad. A few days ago, troops from Zaire, trained and armed by France, also began to arrive in Ndjamena. Thus, the internal conflict in Chad is gradually growing onto an international one, which threatens to exacerbate the situation in the whole region. Washington has welcomed France's military aid to the Habre government, and, at the same time, has unleashed a propaganda campaign against Libya, groundlessly accusing that country of interfering in Chad's internal affairs.

However, UN representatives, and even members of the French government, have admitted that there are no Libyan contingents in Chad, and no Libyan interference of any kind.

The anti-Libyan campaign, stirred up from across the ocean, was needed as a cover for imperialist interference in Chad's affairs, which is preparing for armed intervention in support of the pro-Western regime in Ndjamena.

The military operations in Chad are intensifying, with Ouedde's troops approaching the capital, while the Habre forces continue to withdraw from their positions, Western new agencies report.

In Ndjamena, evaucation of Western personnel, including Americans, has already begun. A danger has arisen of direct military intervention by the Western powers in Chad. All this arouses deep alarm in Africa. The entry into Chad of the troops of any foreign state, OAU chairman and leader of Ethiopia, Haile Mariam Mengistu, has declared could make the situation in Chad still worse and would be against the interests of the people of Chad. That opinion is shared by wide circles of the African and world public.

CPSU POLITBURO ON KOHL TALKS, SHEVARDNADZE REPORT

LD081717 Moscow TASS in English 1710 GMT 8 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 8 TASS -- The Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee discussed at its regular meeting the results of the Soviet-West German talks held in Moscow.

The Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee approved the principled position taken by the Soviet leaders at the talks with the Federal Chancellor of the FRG, Helmut Kohl, and deputy federal chancellor, foreign minister of the FRG, Hans-Dietrich Genscher, concerning the basic issues of security in Europe just as in the development of relations between the USSR and the FRG on a long-term stable and mutually beneficial basis. The talks and conversations held enable the West German side to form a clear idea of the fact that the Soviet Union favours the further development of Soviet-German relations based on the Moscow treaty, which meets the interests of the peoples of the two countries and those of all Europe.

It was pointed out at the meeting that during the talks and conversations the Soviet leaders stressed with good reason that realization of NATO's plans to deploy new American missiles in West Europe will seriously complicate the international situation, increase the war danger for the FRG and adversely affect Soviet-West German relations. The Soviet side stressed the hope that the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, being aware of the responsibility that rests on it in the given situation, will adopt in this matter a realistic position meeting the interests of peace.

In pursuance of the decisions of the May (1982) plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee the Political Bureau examined the question of improving economic relations between agriculture and other branches of the national economy.

The resolution adopted on this question by the CPSU Central Committee and the Council of Ministers of the USSR provides for measures to ensure stable economic conditions for reproduction of an expanded scale on collective and state farms, for a change of the existing procedure for planning and the use of the profits of enterprises and organizations servicing agriculture, for enhancing the interest of purchasing and other organizations servicing collective and state farms in achieving high end results in the output of agricultural produce on the farms serviced, fulfilment of contractual obligations and reduction of the cost of work and services will be now the main criteria in assessing the performance of agriculture-servicing enterprises and organizations of the state committee of the USSR for production and technical services to agriculture, the all-union production and research amalgamation for agrochemical services to agriculture, and the Ministry of Land Improvement and Water Conservancy of the USSR, as well as in forming their funds for material incentives and bonuses. Similarly, purchases of produce will be now the main criteria in assessing the work of purchasing enterprises and organizations.

At its meeting the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee discussed and approved measures, drawn up by the Council of Ministers of the USSR, to develop oil and gas industry on the continental shelf of the USSR for a period ending in 1990.

The Political Bureau approved a report made by Eduard Shevardnadze on talks by the CPSU delegation with a delegation of the Portuguese Communist Party and discussed some other home and foreign policy matters.

DOLGIKH, RYZHKOV, OTHERS ATTEND CPSU CC MEETING

LD081646 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 8 Jul 83

[Text] A conference was held today at the CPSU Central Committee at which, in the light of the decisions of the November 1982 and June 1983 Plenums of the CPSU Central Committee and of the premises and conclusions contained in the speeches by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, there was discussion of ways to improve capital construction and fulfill plans for the current year to bring into operation production capacities, housing and cultural and domestic amenities. A speech was made at the conference by Comrade Dolgikh, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Also taking part in the work of the conference were Comrade Ryzhkov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Comrades Dymshits and Novikov, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers; heads of CPSU Central Committee departments; and other comrades.

It was noted at the conference that since the November plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, a certain amount of work has been done to improve capital construction. All the same, there is no shortage of problems, and deficiencies still remain in this sphere. It was stressed that the second half of the year will be a most busy time, requiring that efforts and resources be concentrated to the maximum to secure the 1983 commissioning program for production capacities and projects of primary importance. Plans for construction of housing and cultural and domestic amenities must be fulfilled without question. Special attention must be devoted to construction projects connected with the solution of major economic tasks as determined by the 26th CPSU Congress and including the construction of installations for the agrarian-industrial complex. Great attention was given to the need for further improvement in political and educational work in labor collectives. Other questions were also discussed at the conference.

USSR ANTI-ZIONIST COMMITTEE DENOUNCES ISRAEL

PM110841 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jul 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Sharp Denunciation"]

[Text] A session of the Presidium of the Anti-Zionist Committee of the Soviet Public was held 4 July under the chairmanship of twice Hero of the Soviet Union, Colonel General D.A. Dragunskiy. The Presidium heard information on the public's numerous proposals to create anti-Zionist committees in a number of the country's union republics and cities and approved this initiative. The creation of republic and city committees will make it possible to satisfy the wishes of the authors of many appeals and letters to take an active part locally in exposing the ideology and practice of international Zionism.

The presidium session also examined the question of creating sector public commissions of the Anti-Zionist Committee of the Soviet Public.

There was a discussion of the question of the Israel's continuing crimes against the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples. The presidium noted that the Israeli authorities are using many methods of terror and "appeasement" from the arsenal of the Nazi war criminals. The Soviet public is particularly angered by the Zionists' sinister practice of using concentration camps to isolate people, to keep them under guard under unbearable conditions, and carry out physical reprisals against them, without trial or investigation and without specific charges or evidence.

Since the defeat of Hitler's reich, the concentration camp system has been used only by the regimes most despised by the peoples -- Pinochet's military-fascist clique, Pol Pot's degenerates. Now, in implementing their racist Zionist ideas, the Israeli rulers are using concentration camps to deal with "the enemies of the chosen nation" -- the Arabs: Palestinians and Lebanese.

In the estimation of foreign observers, about 5,000 prisoners are now languishing in the Israeli concentration camp of (Ansar). Many people whom the Israelis suspect of organizing resistance to prison officers have been taken from (Ansar) to an unknown destination and are being kept in secret in special places of confinement on territories occupied by Israel.

An increasing amount of information is being made public on the use of Gestapo methods of reprisal against the inmates of concentration camps. Thus a number of details have become known concerning killings of (Ansar) concentration camp inmates in June "while they were attempting to escape." At its session the Anti-Zionist Committee of the Soviet Public sharply denounced the Israeli ruling circles' continuing criminal practice.

LENINGRAD CRIME PREVENTION CONFERENCE ENDS

LD110820 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Jul 83 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Guarding the Law"]

[Text] Leningrad, 29 Jun -- A zonal conference of leading workers of the procuracy and internal affairs organs, which ended in Leningrad today, was devoted to the further consolidation of legality and law and order in the light of the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the party Central Committee November (1982) and June (1983) Plenums. Taking part were leaders of internal affairs ministries and administrations, investigation subsections, and procuracies of a number of autonomous republics, oblasts, cities, and rayons.

The need was stressed for the intensification of the struggle against embezzlement of state and public property, bribery, and people leading a parasitic way of life. Special attention was paid to improving the standard of ideological and propaganda work among the population and the citizens' education in a spirit of implacability toward any deviations from the law.

The conference was addressed by A.M. Rekunkov, USSR procurator general.

STOCKHOLM: 3 USSR UNDERGROUND NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS

LD101049 Stockholm Domestic Service in Swedish 1030 GMT 10 Jul 83

[Text] The Seismological Department of Uppsala University registered three underground nuclear explosions in the Soviet Union this morning. The explosions took place in an area north of the Caspian Sea.

TASS REPORTS LAUNCH OF COSMOS-1481 SATELLITE

LD090549 Moscow TASS in English 0543 GMT 9 Jul 83

[Text] Moscow July 9 TASS -- The artificial Earth satellite "Cosmos-1481" was launched in the Soviet Union on Friday to continue the programme of space exploration. The sputnik was put into an orbit with the following parameters: The initial period of revolution -- 11 hours 58 minutes, the maximum distance from the surface of the Earth -- 40,165 kilometres, the minimum -- 615 kilometres, the inclination of the orbit -- 62.8 degrees.

The equipment aboard the sputnik is functioning normally.

MARCHUK TAKES PART IN MOSCOW COMPUTER CONFERENCE

PM241303 Moscow TRUD in Russian 22 Jun 83 p 1

[TASS report: "An Important Means of Progress"]

[Text] Computers, which until quite recently basically played the role of "calculation factories," are joining more and more actively in society's production and creative process. The effectiveness of this businesslike contact between man and the computer and between man and computer-controlled machines depends on the intermediaries -- microprocessors -- and their speed, logic and reliability.

An all-union conference which opened at the Exhibition of National Economic Achievements in Moscow on 21 June is discussing problems of the widespread introduction of microprocessor facilities in the national economy. Taking part in the conference are G.I. Marchuk, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Committee for Science and Technology; I.F. Dimitriyev, chief of a CPSU Central Committee section; ministers, scientists and leaders of enterprises and design bureaus. Leaders of State Committees for Science and Technology and leading computer specialists from Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Cuba, Mongolia, Poland, Romania and Czechoslovakia and CEMA Secretariat executives have arrived for the conference.

MILITARY LEADERS ADDRESS GRADUATION CEREMONIES

PM051414 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Jun 83 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report under the general heading: "Graduation Day at Military Academies"]

[Text] A graduation ceremony has been held at the K. Ye. Voroshilov USSR Armed Forces General Staff Military Academy. The graduates were presented with diplomas and insignia by Marshal of the Soviet Union N. Ogarkov, chief of the Armed Forces General Staff, and USSR first deputy minister of defense. The head of the academy, Army General M. Kozlov, read out the text of a greeting message from Marshal of the Soviet Union D. F. Ustinov, USSR minister of defense, warmly congratulating the graduates on the successful completion of their studies. In his address Marshal of the Soviet Union N. Ogarkov exhorted the graduates to devote all their energies to fulfilling the tasks set the Soviet Armed Forces by the party.

Major General M. Kolesnikov spoke on the graduates' behalf.

Diplomas and insignia have been presented to a large body of graduates from the Marshal of the Soviet Union R. Ya. Malinovskiy Armored Troops Military Academy. A speech was delivered at the graduation ceremony by Marshal of the Soviet Union V. Kulikov, USSR first deputy minister of defense and commander in chief of the Warsaw Pact states' Joint Armed Forces. He read out a message of congratulations from Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov, USSR minister of defense. Marshal of the Soviet Union V. Kulikov exhorted the graduates to adopt a creative approach to the development of military theory and practice, enhance the effectiveness of political education work, and reinforce discipline.

Major Yu. Koshelev and Captain (Joerg)-Dieter Hoffman of the GDR National People's Army spoke on the graduates' behalf.

A ceremony to mark the latest graduation of political worker officers from the V.I. Lenin Military Political Academy has been held. The ceremony was addressed by Army General A. Yepishev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate. He dwelt on the tasks to be solved by the graduates among the troops and in fleets, and exhorted them to devote all their energies to implementing the decisions of the 26th party congress and the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum, the instructions of Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, on enhancing the country's defense capability, and and the USSR defense minister's demands. A message of congratulations from Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov, USSR minister of defense, was read out to the graduates by the head of the academy, Colonel General G. Sredin.

Captain 3d Class A. Karelin and Lieutenant Colonel Karl-Erich Haushildt of the GDR National People's Army spoke on the graduates' behalf.

An address was delivered at a graduation day ceremony at the M.V. Frunze Military Academy by Marshal of the Soviet Union V. Petrov, commander in chief of Land Forces and USSR deputy minister of defense. He read out a message of congratulations from Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov, USSR minister of defense, and expressed confidence that the knowledge and energy of the alumni of this military training establishment will be directed toward further enhancing the Soviet Armed Forces' combat readiness. The head of the academy, Army General G. Obaturov, Senior Lecturer Colonel I. Nikonov, Major V. Boykov, and Captain Ryagmar Dovchingiyk of the Mongolian People's Army, spoke at the ceremony. Graduation day ceremonies have been held at a number of other military academies.